INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 6. (NEW SERIES.) JUNE, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	161
The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	166
Another Look at the Budget, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	167
The Moplahs and the Land Tax in India, by J. Dacosta	168
Frontiers and Finance, by an Independent Politician	170
Magistrates on Tour, by A. Nundy	172
India in the British Parliament	174
Our London Letter	175
The Predominant Partner	177
Lord G. Hamilton's Defence	179
State Landlordism in Madras	180
Money and the Movement of Prices	181
Indian Troops for the Sudan: Opinions of the Press	182
The Cotton Duties: Memorial to Lord G. Hamilton, etc.	186
Reviews: The Spoils of War	189
The Theosophy of the Vedas	190
The Hindu at Home	191
A Hindustani Grammar	192
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	192
Recent Official Publications	192

Indiana.

The Cotton Duties.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN moved the adjournment of the House of Commons on May 18th in order to call attention to the effects of Lord George Hamilton's recent re-arrangement of the Indian cotton duties. The critics of the motion, which was virtually closured, contradict each other. Sir Henry Fowler, after a consultation with Lord George Hamilton behind the Speaker's chair, condemned it as premature and immature. The *Manchester Guardian*, on the other hand, declared that it was "quite out of date." Both cannot be right, but both may be wrong. The motion for adjournment, which Sir W. Wedderburn describes and discusses on another page, was the climax of a series of efforts directed against what public opinion in India regards as an inequitable and unnecessary piece of taxation. Sir Henry Fowler announced his willingness to discuss the question, and to defend his own policy, at the "proper time." But when will that occasion arise? Is it not Mr. Henley who sings, "In the streets of By-and-by, stands the hostelry of Never"? Under the provisions of the Indian Councils Act the Secretary of State for India is empowered to disallow measures which have received the assent of the Viceroy. The efforts of Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues of the Indian Parliamentary Committee sought first by private communications, then by memorial, and finally by a motion in the House of Commons, to secure the relief for which the people of India prayed. The motion would have been submitted a week earlier but for the congested condition of the debate on the Education Bill and the imminent publication of a Blue-book on the cotton duties. When it was submitted, Lord G. Hamilton had given his assent to the obnoxious measures. But it was still open to him to remit, by executive order, the duties to which exception was taken. Sir W. Wedderburn's proposal, which has been fully explained in our columns, is set forth in the Memorial addressed to Lord George Hamilton by the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Their contention, urged by all sections of opinion in India, official and non-official, Indian and Anglo-Indian, is that by the new Acts which the Government of India was compelled to accept last January, a wholly unnecessary tax is imposed upon the poorer class of consumers in India at a time when relief is given to the comparatively well-to-do.

The Burdens of the Poor.

THE unanimity of opinion in India and the gravity of the indignation which has been aroused, will not be disputed by anybody acquainted with the facts. In February, 1895, when the cotton duties were about to be included in Sir J. Westland's tariff, Sir H. James moved the adjournment of the House in order to complain that the duties would result in Protection. The motion—immature and premature though it may have been—was not discouraged by Sir Henry Fowler, who defended his policy in language which

a clerical admirer afterwards compared to Burke. Sir H. Fowler added that if Protection could be proved, he would take all possible steps to prevent it. The motion was defeated. But it cost many Lancashire Liberals their seats, especially as Lord George Hamilton, who had stigmatised the duties as unfair to Lancashire, re-asserted his opinion as Secretary of State on the eve of the General Election. Lancashire weavers and cotton-spinners were invited in the largest type and the most vehement tones to "Vote for the Unionists and the Repeal of the Cotton Duties." It remained for Lord George Hamilton to redeem his pledge. But, as the Indian Parliamentary Committee contend, he did far more. Reducing the duties from 5 to 3½ per cent., and extending the excise duties to all cotton cloths woven in Indian mills, he at once diminished the burden upon the comfortable classes, who wear the finer cloths previously subject to a 5 per cent. duty, and increased the burden upon the poorer classes, who wear the coarse cloths that were previously subject to no duty at all. It is easy to say that a "boycott" of Lancashire cottons is impracticable in India. That is not the point. The point is that the "boycott" has been advocated on what appear to the people of India to be reasonable grounds. Lord George Hamilton says that whatever agitation there was in India has died out. Violent agitation, upon which his argument seems to set a premium, may for the moment have subsided at the prospect of redress. But the sense of injustice remains and, as the best authorities agree in thinking, is not less but more dangerous for being driven inwards. Lord George Hamilton, whose courtesy was acknowledged by Sir W. Wedderburn on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, has not been in India, and therefore may not appreciate adequately the gravity of a widespread sense of injury at the hands of the Imperial Government. Sir John Leng has just returned from India, and he found everywhere signs of strong and bitter resentment.

The Magnanimity of Sir H. Fowler.

NOBODY, we imagine, who has observed the career of Sir Henry Fowler since he became Secretary of State for India was in the least degree surprised at his extraordinary conduct in attacking the motion and repudiating its authors. But in the case of any other man, holding a similar position, such conduct would have been strange. Lord George Hamilton has overthrown Sir H. Fowler's policy on the question of the cotton duties as he reversed his policy on the question of Chitral. But Sir H. Fowler, like Gallio, cares for none of these things. He is too magnanimous. When Sir W. Wedderburn and his friends denounced Lord G. Hamilton's policy in Chitral, and upheld the policy of his predecessor, Sir H. Fowler indicated his interest in the proceedings by leaving the House. When they criticised Lord G. Hamilton's re-arrangement of the cotton duties, Sir H. Fowler, who has not yet been Chancellor of the Exchequer, singled them out for vehement attack, although he had received specially early information as to their intentions, and, indeed, as to their proceedings from the first. These are, it is true, somewhat odd manifestations of Liberal principle. But, at any rate, Sir H. Fowler's zeal made it abundantly clear that the motion was not a party motion. The Indian Parliamentary Committee did its work admirably. It proved a thoroughly efficient instrument for securing an Indian discussion even at a time of exceptional pressure in the House of Commons. But the fact that, with the exception of the Front Bench, the whole Opposition rose to support Sir W. Wedderburn's motion might, but for Sir H. Fowler's speech, have given a party tinge to the incident, especially as not one of the supporters of the Government did anything to obtain or to strengthen the discussion. This apparent one-sidedness was the more curious as the ranks of the Ministerialists include, to say nothing of Mr. Bhownaggree, some distinguished Anglo-Indians who are known to sympathise with the complaints put forward by Sir W. Wedderburn. Mr. Bhownaggree went so far as to take notes of the discussion. But his courage stopped short of a speech. Yet the Indian Parliamentary Committee had left no stone unturned to secure the active co-operation of many of the Government's supporters. The incident will undoubtedly strengthen the common belief that Conservatives, when their party is in power, will not kick against the pricks. Liberal members interested in the welfare of India had many pitched battles with the late Liberal Government on Indian questions and, on the question of simultaneous examinations, defeated it. It looks as if it were easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a Conservative to act with independence.

Lord Welby's Commission.

THE Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure still cultivates secrecy in its deliberations at the India Office. The affectation of mystery is hard to understand and harder to justify. We ask again on what grounds the public and the Press are debarred from being present. Is public criticism feared? Are the facts of Indian expenditure and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom such that they cannot, with dignity and safety, be divulged? It is unfortunate that such questions should be encouraged, as they are, by the procedure adopted by Lord Welby and a majority of his colleagues. That publicity will be permanently avoided cannot be expected by the most sanguine obscurantist. The

evidence will, we presume, be published at some time. Or is it thought that its mere bulk, if it be presented to the public as a whole, will disarm all save official readers? Such a result, if it occurred, would be a great misfortune. The electors of the United Kingdom are, theoretically, responsible for the good government of India, but they are rarely reminded of their trust unless Indian troops are being borrowed to do Imperial work at the expense of India, or import duties—themselves a product and an indication of Indian financial embarrassments—are resented by Lancashire. If the proceedings before Lord Welby's Commission had been reported, however baldly, in the Press, many readers might at least have been reminded that there *is* an Indian question, and an inkling of its meaning might, without an undue strain upon their faculties, have been borne in upon them. But how many of them will sit down to sift the ponderous volumes which, two or three years hence, will give us the whole mass of the evidence in a lump? Besides, if we dare drop such a hint, some suggestions might, in the other case, have been forthcoming from the outside for the benefit of the Commission. It is not, however, too late for the Commission to mend its ways, and if it still refuses to extend its hospitality to the public, may we suggest that it should follow the example of the recently-appointed Commission on Liquor Licensing Laws, as to which the following announcement was made a few days ago:—

"The public will not be admitted to the meetings of the Royal Commission on Licensing, but the Press (except when private matters are discussed) will be represented."

There is another little act of thoughtfulness, also, which the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure seems to have overlooked. It is reported to have divided its subject-matter into sections. When the first section is complete, so far as the evidence is concerned, why should not that part of the evidence be issued in a single volume without delay?

Some Maxims from Lord Rosebery. IT is often instructive to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to Indian affairs the words of wisdom which fall from the lips of British statesmen with reference to other subjects. Lord Rosebery, speaking in Devonshire on May 15th, repudiated the doctrine that "the great masses of the people of this country do not care much about foreign policy":—

"I venture to say that those who hold that doctrine are wrong, first, because foreign policy is a question of expenditure, and, secondly, because it is a question of honour. *Your policy and your expenditure are so closely allied that they are almost interchangeable terms, because your expenditure must depend largely upon your policy, and your policy must depend largely upon your expenditure.*"

Precisely. Yet Sir Henry Fowler, when he undertook to appoint a Commission to enquire into the administration and management of Indian expenditure, essayed to mark off questions of policy as forbidden, if not sacred, ground. "Your policy and your expenditure are so closely allied that they are almost interchangeable terms." Lord Welby's Commission has doubtless proved the truth of the proposition in spite of the warnings of Sir Henry Fowler—which, however, found no place in the terms of the reference. There was another passage in Lord Rosebery's speech to which the reform party in India will do well to pay attention. He was describing the battle which now lies before the Liberal party:—

"Let me tell you quite frankly that you have a stiff task before you. You have to fight three giants—three enemies in one. You have, in the first place, to fight the present Government—a giant with feet of clay, you may think, but a giant at any rate which exercises the almost unlimited power with which it was entrusted at the last election. But you have, in the next place, to fight not merely the Government, but the people who returned them to power. For some time after a general election such as the last, those who voted Tory, nay, those who abstained from voting Liberal, or from voting at all, will feel that they are in some degree participators in, in some degree responsible for, the action of the present Government. . . . . Well, you have a third enemy to fight against, and I am not sure that that is not the most formidable of all. You have got to fight the apathy of the country.—(Hear, hear.) It was from the apathy of the country that the last general election drew its chief results."

If this be said in the green tree, where one of the great parties in British politics is contending against the other, what must be said in the dry, where Indian reformers, destitute of votes, are endeavouring to enlist the sympathy of this "apathetic" country on the side of their legitimate but unfamiliar grievances? The lesson, it seems to us, is twofold. In the first place, the Congress leaders should see, as most of them do see, the need of patience. They should not be unduly cast down if the rate of progress seems to be dismally slow. But, in the second place, they should keep their powder dry and leave no stone unturned to "fight the apathy" of the United Kingdom.

The North Aberdeen Election. THE retirement of Dr. W. A. Hunter from Parliament is a serious loss to the party of Indian reform who, on so many criticical occasions, were able to draw upon his wide knowledge, ripe experience and sound judgment. His absence from the House of Commons, and, still more, the cause of it, will be deeply regretted in India. If anything could have mitigated the loss, it would have been the election, as his successor, of so able and independent a politician, and so tried and true a friend of India, as Professor Murison. There was, we believed, good reason to anticipate that the choice of North Aberdeen would fall upon our distinguished contributor. He was defeated, not by the votes of the electors, but by the methods of a political caucus. He was too chivalrous

to approach the Liberal executive until his friend Dr. Hunter had formally retired, and when, almost at the eleventh hour, he visited the constituency, the ground had been already salted. Those who know anything of North Aberdeen know perfectly well that, even so, Professor Murison would have been elected by a handsome majority if he had stood as an independent candidate. We have nothing to say of Captain Pirie, who nearly lost the seat, except that he was emphatically not the better man. On the morrow of the poll the attempts of the Liberal newspapers to explain the melting away of Dr. Hunter's tremendous majority, and the highly creditable performance of the Independent Labour party, were pathetic as well as ludicrous. The question which this election raises is, we do not hesitate to say, a vital question for the Liberal party. Anything more fatuous than the present practice—as distinguished from the theory—of selecting Liberal candidates in some constituencies, it is impossible to conceive.

India in the British Press.

NOTHING is more common in the letters which we receive from Indian correspondents than the complaint that the English press is, as regards Indian questions, "nobbled" by "the officials," and that only the official view is presented to the public. What is meant is not, we imagine, that English journalists are bribed—which would be an outrageous and grotesque calumny—but that through private influence, and the supply of information, the official clique secures undue favour at their hands. There is some truth in the complaint, though not, we think, so much as its authors imagine. It is not probable that many journals in the United Kingdom employ a leader-writer, to say nothing of a sub-editor, whose special subject is India. Indian questions, to put it bluntly, are not, or are not believed to be, "good business" for English newspapers. The result is that on the not very numerous occasions when Indian questions become prominent—as, for example, when the Indian Budget is laid before Parliament, when the cotton duties cause a stir, or when Indian troops are sent to Egypt—the leader-writer, who expresses opinion, and the sub-editor, who sets out news, have to do the best they can in a hurry. What is the result? The Blue-book supplies the one, and Reuter's telegrams, or the special telegrams to the *Times*, supply the other. Hence, unless the individual journalist happens in some way to have been brought into touch with independent Indian opinion, or an Indian question has become to some extent a party question in this country, official statements and opinions are more or less complacently reproduced. It is a matter, not of "nobbling," but of hurry, and of "the line of least resistance." There is a good deal of human nature in journalists. General complaints and regrets that this is the case are futile. What might be useful is an organised endeavour to supply English newspapers, in a convenient form, with the facts and the opinions on which educated Indians rely. This is a very different thing from sending over bundles of newspapers, unwieldy packages of memorials, undigested pamphlets, windy speeches, and discursive articles. The destination of these things is, and will remain, the waste-paper basket. But we believe that much might be done by the intelligent, regular, and prompt supply of concise and well-digested information. English journalists "in the lump" are, we are very sure, on the side of fair play. But they are human, they are very much occupied with questions that are not Indian, and they are often over-worked. It is idle to complain that they ignore independent Indian opinion unless steps are taken systematically to bring that opinion to their knowledge in a compact and convenient form. This can be, and therefore ought to be, done.

"Determined Optimism."

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—"When a special article in the *Times* can be reprinted in the columns of INDIA without unfavourable comments, there is some ground for the assumption that the Indian national cause is making headway in England. The value of this article, on the cost of solvency to India, is enhanced by the fact that it was not a mere haphazard effusion at variance with the general tone of the criticisms on Indian affairs appearing in the same columns. Rather it appears to have been the latest and most extreme development of the writer's interest in his subject. Would that the same felicitations could be extended to the editorial staff and the special correspondents of the *Times*! Unfortunately the conversion appears to be sporadic merely, for the foreign telegrams, the leading articles, the Parliamentary notes and reports still bear the stamp of official complacency and ignorance, and even the writer of 'Indian Affairs' has much prejudice to slough off before he can be regarded as a fair and impartial critic of his subject. Prince Alfonso of Portugal is blamed for the 'note of determined optimism' which marked his despatches in connexion with the Goan insurrection. Is there nothing of 'determined optimism' in the opinion that 'European Powers domiciled in the East must preserve their supremacy by a perfect civil and military organisation such as Great Britain alone seems able to maintain in Asia?' Is it, then, by force of arms that we hold, or can in the last resort hope to hold, our glorious Indian Empire? Pity rather than surprise fills the mind when one hears an intelligent supporter of the present Ministry soberly declare that 'if India

is ever so ungrateful as to forget the benefits conferred on her by English rule and revolt, the rebellion can be crushed again as it has been before.' After all, that is the popular view of the Indian mutiny. But what is to be thought of the mental attitude which admits a just conception of the terrible state of Indian finance, yet, while conceding the possibility of disturbances in the South Western districts, regards them as due, if they occur, merely to the bad example set by Portugese subjects; which permits the use of such expressions as 'our irresistible position in Asia'; and which 'recognises that it is only our overwhelming force in Asia which saves us from similar troubles on a far greater scale'? Is not this something like 'determined optimism'?

The Troops for the Sudan.

"It is now two months since the suggestion was first made that an Indian force should occupy Suakin. The suggestion was welcomed, and its reception was made the occasion of a great deal of self-laudation by the organ which professes to lead English public opinion. It was allowed that English appreciation of the financial necessities of India and of the injustice involved in the present distribution of burdens left something to be desired. But it was confidently stated that in spite of our backward education in this respect we had still learned something considerable during the last thirty years—be it noted here that the 'forward' policy has during the last twenty years enjoyed its most remarkable degree of prosperity—and that when the Royal Commission on Indian finance published its report the education of the British electorate and their representatives would receive a further impetus. This at least was certain, that the iniquitous arrangement by which England borrowed Indian troops for her own purposes and charged the Indian Government for their pay could never recur, and must to the next generation of Englishmen appear incredible. Alas for the optimism we were encouraged to cherish! The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated on May 12th that, having regard to previous precedents, the ordinary expenditure of the Suakin troops would be charged upon India. What reception would be accorded to the proposal to borrow your neighbour's horse for several months' heavy work on condition that the said neighbour paid for the animal's corn? Such is the nature of the proposal which a blind and selfish adherence to a bad precedent induces the Government to lay before Parliament; which the Tory Ministry after unsuccessful attempts at evasion have only under strong pressure consented to discuss in a formal debate after the vacation; which, finally, seems likely to be treated as a fair subject for purely partizan strife and supported in violation of all considerations of justice by the rank and file of the Tory party, merely in order to prevent their political opponents from scoring even the semblance of a triumph. Consider, too, into what a position the obstinacy of the Government has brought them. If they carry their proposal they gain, in the sacred cause of party, a victory over the consciences of their supporters. If they fail to carry the proposal they suffer that most shameful of all defeats, a defeat in a wrong cause, and in a battle of their own provoking.

The Russian Spectre.

"With a Cabinet controlled by the Minister who is primarily responsible for the revival of the forward frontier policy in 1876, and with Lord George Hamilton at the India Office, he would indeed be a worthy successor to the immortal Mark Tapley who could view with equanimity the outlook in Asia. It is now stated that Russia is about to build a railway that will bring her within striking distance of Herat, and an alarm is raised. Russia acknowledges the project, pleads purely commercial motives, in which plea she is supported by so great an authority as Colonel Gerard, and assures us that her policy in Asia will be guided solely by the policy of Great Britain. If Russia acted up to the letter of such a declaration, the prospects of lasting peace in Asia would be indeed poor; for even the most ardent supporter of the forward policy will hardly claim that its tendency is pacific. It is openly admitted that the latest Russian move is probably due to the reports which have reached St. Petersburg as to the 'enormous stores and great preparations for advance at the end of the North-Western Railway of India.' No attempt is made to deny the existence of such stores and preparations, or to explain the purpose of them. Moreover, half a crore of rupees is to be set aside this year for mobilization. Everything seems to indicate a pursuance of the policy of aggression in an aggravated form. It is England not Russia who is taking the offensive. Russia, although her designs may not be so peaceful as she asserts, certainly maintains for the most part a defensive attitude, abandoning it only when it suits her policy in Manchuria and Corea to provoke British activity and fix British attention on the mountainous wastes of Afghanistan, and to secure freedom from jealous interference with her purposes on the Pacific Coast. To accuse her of designs on India by way of Afghanistan is to accuse her of mad folly. Yet, as Simla well knows, the accusation is almost certain to receive credit in England. While the forces that fight against progress are flourishing with such undiminished vigour it is worse than folly to turn our gaze backwards and contemplate what little has been achieved with anything approaching satisfaction."

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

A PARLIAMENTARY PROTEST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

Strait is the gate and narrow is the way for any Member who desires to raise a debate in the House of Commons on an Indian grievance. He cannot bring it up on the British Estimates by moving a reduction of the Secretary of State's salary, because the Secretary of State for India is privileged to help himself from the Indian Treasury without a vote from the House of Commons. The Member who desires to appeal unto Cæsar has therefore only two alternatives remaining: to move the adjournment of the House; or wait for that dim and distant day, the "Indian Budget," on which, some time in August or September, the accumulated complaints, appeals, hopes, and aspirations of 250 millions of our fellow subjects are summarily disposed of by a few scattered members before a jaded and empty House.

If the matter is in his view emergent he must try to move the adjournment; and he at once finds himself surrounded by countless snares and pitfalls. He must in the first place satisfy the Speaker that the matter is not only of public importance, but also that it is "definite and urgent." As in the days of Lenthall, so now also, the Speaker has neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak but as the House is pleased to direct; the Speaker must represent the average feeling of the House, and from this point of view how many Indian grievances will be deemed of public importance? *A fortiori*, how many will be judged to be urgent when in competition with home questions of burning party interest? And having satisfied the Speaker on these points our Member must arrange for at least forty sympathisers to be present in the House at the right moment, and rise in their places to support his motion. Anyone acquainted with the ways of the House knows what a difficult task this is. Members are at all times liable to be called away for one reason or another, and with the best intention often fail to keep their appointments. A Government Whip responsible to prevent a count knows this well, and does not consider himself safe unless, in order to provide a House of forty members, he has got a promise from at least 100. For a private Member to make certain of these forty good men and true, is thus a source of continuing anxiety. And even if he is successful in these various proceedings, he may still be baffled by any single Member who chooses to put down a blocking motion; that is who gives notice of a resolution bearing on the same subject. If this is done, as was done on May 13th in the case of the Indian troops at Suakin, no one is allowed to move the adjournment to call attention to the same subject matter. Further, comes the danger of the closure which, as in the case of Chitral, may be applied at the very commencement of the proceedings. Also, you must stand up exactly at the right moment, which is after question time, immediately after the last question has been asked, or your opportunity may be gone for ever. Finally some technical point raised at the last moment, some small oversight in procedure, may wreck the frail bark even as it seems safely to be entering port.

Such being the dangers which beset the adventurous soul who contemplates moving the adjournment of the House, it must be admitted that we have on the whole been fortunate as regards the case of the Indian Cotton Duties. The precedent of Sir Henry James's motion in February of last year was a valuable one, and I was able to satisfy the Speaker that the grievance in question was definite and urgent, mainly by pointing out that it lay in the hands of the Secretary of State at once to remedy the evil which was arousing so much ill-feeling in India. Acting in his executive capacity he could, by a stroke of the pen, either disallow the obnoxious Acts altogether, or at least remit those duties which pressed upon the poorest class of consumers.

Accordingly the Speaker accepted the motion, and asked the House whether it would give leave to move the adjournment. And then the independent members who sit on the Liberal side came bravely to the front. The Indian Parliamentary Committee had done their work well. They came themselves, and brought their friends; so the striking spectacle was seen of the whole unofficial Opposition rising in a body, and amid hearty cheers leave was given; and poor India was allowed an opportunity vicariously to record a protest against the injustice which has been done to her. In this matter the thanks of India are especially due to the Irish Members who in full numbers gave their support, for they did so against their direct interest, which is at present to oppose any delay which may interfere with the early passing of the promised Irish Land Bill. Acknowledgments are also due to the Members connected with Lancashire, who put justice to India before any personal considerations.

The Government put on the closure when Mr. Souttar rose to support the motion. It is much to be regretted that the House was deprived of the opportunity of hearing a gentleman whose long residence in India in an independent position entitled him to speak with authority. Other independent Members, by rising, also showed their desire to challenge the official version of the case. But the discussion was cut short, and we had no opportunity for a reply. Under these circumstances, the debate having been thus maimed and rendered incomplete, there was no alternative for me but to withdraw the motion, with a view to bring up the matter again upon another occasion. Looking to the overwhelming majority of the Government, it was not possible to obtain any important concession. But it was always something in the right direction that Mr. Arthur Balfour, in consideration of the withdrawal, promised to do his best to bring on the Indian Budget at an early date. Sir H. Fowler stated that he was prepared to make his defence, and that the defence would be made at the proper time. It is desirable to know when that convenient season will come, and how he proposes to create the opportunity he contemplates. It is probable that he will be publicly questioned on this important point.

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE BUDGET.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

By grace of accident and the turning of the screw, the Indian Budget, as we have seen, has just succeeded in getting itself formally balanced. But it is only the purely official mind that can experience any solid satisfaction from the performance. The result is all but absolutely negative, and the dreary stone will have to be rolled up the rough hillside again next year with the same oppressive labour and vexation. None more than ourselves would rejoice to be able to congratulate Sir James Westland on a genuine surplus based on a natural expansion of the resources of the country—a healthy surplus bringing honest cheer to the hearts of the people. When shall that good time be?

Certainly not until Sir James's military colleagues shall be kept from thwarting his anxious endeavours with their foolish and futile enterprises. The pages of this magazine have displayed in the fullest detail the disastrous influence of military expenditure upon the Calcutta finances, and the utter hopelessness of their retrieval so long as that influence remains in the ascendant. There is no question at all that the army in India must be sufficient in strength and in equipment, and ready for any necessary service. So far one can agree with Sir Henry Brackenbury. But where lies the necessity for such enormous expenditure as has been going on for many years along the north-western frontier? During the past year alone, the Chitral expedition cost, according to Sir Henry Brackenbury, no less than 173½ lakhs. But for this drain, "the whole military expenditure would have been 79 lakhs below the estimates." Consider, then, the difference to the Budget if there had been no Chitral expedition; and the further difference in future Budgets if there were no continued occupation of the country. The question inevitably works round to the point of policy, and that, we take it, is absolutely beyond argument. It was no necessary service on which these 173½ lakhs were expended. The frontier is not a whit safer or less unfriendly than it would have been at the present moment if there had been no expedition whatever. The thing is the merest wantonness of military caprice. It is time that the Russian bugbear were summarily extruded from our imaginations. With the three great passes under English guns, we may sleep comfortably—even if Russia wants India. It is very certain that India, in spite of all our provocations, does not want Russia.

With regard to internal military needs, it is but cheap rhetoric to contrast, as Sir James Westland contrasted, the peace and security given to the country under British rule with the war and disturbance that previously reigned. The argument can easily miss the point, and it might readily be stretched to cover ten times as many lakhs as Sir Henry Brackenbury threw away on Chitral. Peace and security once established, can it be contended seriously that the present army, with all the expenditure it entails, is required for their permanent maintenance? Such a contention would be nothing short of ridiculous. The country would be absolutely peaceful and secure with the merest formality of an army, if it had but reasonable prosperity and were governed without gratuitous irritations. When the internal need of an army is in question, it is well to recall the attitude of the general population of India even during the very crisis of the Great Mutiny itself. But while it is obviously necessary that the army should be sufficient and effectively equipped, it does not follow that needless expense may not be incurred in keeping up with the newest inventions. The military secretary naturally desires to signalise his tenure of office by external signs of improved efficiency; he aims at breaking the record. This spirit, essentially good and not to be damped inconsiderately, still needs to be watched and controlled. The saving of 16½ lakhs a year on ammunition, clothing, and war material generally, points to an important means of evading the toll of exchange, and of stimulating internal industries. The pressure of necessity seems at length to be opening our official eyes to the probability of getting more golden eggs out of the goose by feeding the animal judiciously than by starving her outright. The more comfortable her condition, the less likely is she to be perverse.

Too many of Sir James Westland's arguments seem to betray an official compulsion of forgetfulness of the practical working of his finance operations. The immediate business of the Finance Minister is to balance his books, no doubt; but the essential business, after all, is to establish and maintain contentment among the people. In the face of the fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency—and these can be more or less paralleled in other parts of the country—what practical use is there in pointing out that the share in land assessments taken by the Government "has been steadily reduced during the last hundred years"? The argument can bring no consolation to the poor people that are sold up. If the fact be correctly stated, then there is an important screw loose somewhere else, and this screw requires to be very promptly tightened. In the abstract, indeed, "the charge of one rupee per head of population is not a high price to pay for the protection afforded;" but what if that single rupee cannot be paid without a feeling of pressure that does not tend to satisfaction with the Government that extracts it? The condition of the people demands some little consideration. The cost of government must be proportioned to the strength of the backs that have got to bear it. Our Indian administrators do not seem to get into their heads effectively the fact that they are dealing, not with a rich country, but with a population that is extremely and exceptionally poor. What would even a rich country like England say to a demand of one shilling out of every sovereign of income for the costs of military expenditure alone? How incomparably more grievous, then, is such a demand when so few of the population possess an income beyond the necessities of a very spare livelihood, and so many millions always hover on the margin of a bare existence?

Sir James Westland's logic on the famine grant is apparently unimpeachable. Strictly, perhaps, there is no such thing as a Famine Fund. Though

we expected an assignment of a crore and a half, we ought to applaud the generosity of the Government in conceding a crore. It is obviously perverse that the people should not be satisfied. The Government may, however, be reminded of the virtuously indignant protest of Lord Lytton against the suggestion that the so-called famine fund would not be steadily and strictly maintained. What is the value of that protest now? And what is the good of a precisian logic in face of a popular interpretation of the Government intentions emphasised with the solemn and burning protestation of a Governor-General? This famine fund—or whatever it may be designated—was a thing that touched the hearts and imaginations of the people, and might have been worked to issues of the highest general importance—a far higher importance than even the immediate purpose of protection from famine. But the ardent imagination of the people has been severely douched by the cold logic of the Government. Could there be a more cogent illustration of the hopeless inability of officialism to grasp the true basis of successful government of an Eastern population? The famine grant simply depends on a surplus. A surplus ought to have been always a matter of course. But how much could have been done with the idea! And how much has been undone by the chill substitution of a chunk of logic?

Consider this nicely balanced Budget from the point of view of the salt tax. "The salt tax, according to Mr. Connell"—we quote from an article in the *Times*, reprinted in India for May—"was augmented by 18 million of rupees between 1884-85 and 1893-94. Sir James Westland's Budget shows a still further increase, making a total addition of about 23 million rupees levied on a necessity of life between 1884-85 and 1895-96." This increase, it is explained, "arises partly from an increase in the population, partly from their power of purchasing larger quantities of salt, partly from a windfall, and partly from a more uniform levy of the tax throughout India." The increase in the population means mainly an increase in misery; the more uniform levy of the tax throughout India means an injustice to some in order to relieve the galling pinch to others; the power of purchasing larger quantities is merely a delusive way of stating that larger quantities were in fact purchased. This tax may indeed be, as General Chesney thought, "the least irksome form of taxation that could be devised"—for the collectors of excise duty; for the population, it is certainly the most irksome and irritating. It is the standing opprobrium of Government. Salt is a necessity of life to man and animal; yet the duty placed upon it by a beneficent Government is something like 4,000 per cent. on the market price. The official compiler of the "Moral and Material Progress of India" Blue-book computes that, taking together agricultural and household salt, "over the whole of British India the average incidence of the salt tax is 4¾ annas (or about 4d) per head of the population." Like the rupee for military protection, fourpence a head for salt looks a very trifling affair indeed. But the significance of it is, not lightness of taxation, but deplorable poverty of the people.

The question of the poverty of India, is fundamental, and will have to be seriously faced. The manipulation of Budget figures may serve to lull the uneasiness of those that take their views of India without independent examination from official sources; but at the best it can only slur over the real problems of Indian Government and administration. Instead of plucking the fleeces of the flock, we ought to be filling their bellies. There can be no real contentment with English rule so long as there exists such painful poverty, with the aggravation of irritating taxation. Yet it is the friendly feeling and confidence of the natives that forms the very basis of our Indian Empire. There is no sense in underrating the advantages of external security and internal peace; but, after all, when it comes to the pinch, these things are assumed as matters of course, and it would be folly to expect hungry men to be satisfied with such achievement on the part of the Government. These advantages are merely preliminary. The true work of government then begins. How little progress we have yet made, with all our good intentions and arduous labours, is only too painfully manifest. "With all its assessing, and irrigating, and railway building, and settling, the Government of India is not able, one year with another, to get an average of two rupees an acre rent from the cultivated area of the Empire of India. Upon this thin base is the superstructure of our costly and wasteful administration reared." Thus wrote Mr. A. J. Wilson in the *Investors' Review* for September last, in an article on "Indian Finance," to which attention was urgently drawn in these columns. That article may well stand as a commentary on the Indian Budget, profoundly damnatory yet thoroughly sound, until the Finance Minister takes his courage in both hands, and reforms his accounts. But the Finance Minister, it must be recognised, is bound hand and foot by the policy of the Government; and can the Government be moved to repress futile military adventure and foster the real development of internal prosperity even under the menace of catastrophe? Must it be a condition precedent that the menace be realised in disaster?

THE MOPLAHS AND THE LAND TAX IN INDIA.

By J. Dacosta.

Agriculture, which is the staple industry in India, was introduced in pre-historic times by immigrant races whose descendants still pursue the same avocation in our Indian provinces, the aborigines of the country having retired into hill tracts and forests where we find them now living in a state of semi-civilisation. The laws and customs of the immigrant communities remained long in force, and were respected even by the Muhammadan conquerors of India, probably because they were found to be based on principles of justice and the natural wants of the people, and doubtless also because their observance had produced so high a degree of prosperity that the wealth of India had become proverbial among the nations of the earth. A main drift of those laws

was to secure to each individual the fruit of his industry, while it laid on him an equitable share of the duty of protecting the lives and property of the community.

The Moplahs, who cultivate the land on the western side of the Indian peninsula, are one of those immigrant races, and are believed, from certain traits of character, to have Ishmaelitic blood in their veins. The British officials of the district represent them as "the most thrifty and industrious community in the Malabar;" and the following particulars regarding their laws and customs, which were published in the *Pioneer* of the 25th March last, may interest the reader:—

> "From time immemorial it was a recognised law of landlord and tenant, that a lease was good for twelve years and, at the expiration of that term, it was an invariable custom to permit the tenant to renew his lease in paying twenty per cent. of the amount of the lease as a renewal fee. When that fee was paid, the landlord had no right to ask for any increase in the lease amount, or to oust the tenant."

Thus the landlord's claim for rent was permanently fixed by law, and the tenant was allowed to lay by savings, wherewith he could improve his farm and homestead, and tide over seasons of drought and inundation. The same code of laws protected the landlord from arbitrary demands of the *Rájá* or ruler of the country, by solemn injunctions resting on popular moral precepts, which in the course of time acquired the force and the very sanctity of religion. These conditions fully account for the accumulation of wealth which amazed nations less equitably ruled; they account also for the industrious and law-abiding spirit which distinguishes the people of India. The gentle manners of the Hindus, however, encouraged the aggression, while their wealth excited the cupidity, of the predatory hordes who overran and devastated many fertile tracts of the country, until the Mughal empire was established. That empire, which rested on despotism, was tottering under its own weight when the British first landed in India. Corruption and anarchy reigned in several provinces; satraps oppressed and despoiled the people, thus creating a state of things which enabled the Chartered Company of British Merchants, who had obtained from their Government the monopoly of the trade with India, to establish and extend their dominion in various directions far beyond the limits of their factories. Their rapid success in amassing wealth excited envy among their countrymen at home, and rumours of criminal methods being used by the English in India, in the acquisition of wealth, alarmed the moral sense of the nation. An enquiry was forthwith instituted into the Company's administration, which led to restrictions being placed on their powers, when their charter had to be renewed. Similar investigations were thenceforth periodically held, which facilitated the introduction of reform. Crown courts were established in the Presidency towns, undue restrictions which had been exercised over the press were removed, and other improvements were made in the administration.

Meanwhile the British Cabinet sought to obtain a power of direct interference in the management of affairs in India. The power they coveted was an irresponsible power, since Parliament was the only authority to which they were responsible, and Parliament contained no representative of the Indian populations whose interests were concerned in the matter. Nevertheless a Bill was passed creating a Board of Control for Indian Affairs, the president of which was to be a member of the Government, and the evil was aggravated by a clause providing secrecy for the proceedings of that board. This unconstitutional step led to the adoption of the unwise policy towards Afghanistan which involved us in our first war with that country—a war the disastrous and humiliating termination of which, in 1842, startled the world. The same irresponsible power prompted and enforced the discreditable policy which undoubtedly resulted in the rebellion and mutinies of 1857 and 1858. The appalling amount of blood and treasure expended in attempts to suppress the rebellion, and the anxiety which agitated the nation while British supremacy in India trembled in the balance, suggested a radical change in our system of governing India. The Chartered Company and the Board of Control were abolished, and the powers they had exercised were vested in a Principal Secretary of State, assisted by a Council, whose concurrence was declared to be essential in all matters involving the expenditure of Indian revenue. This restraint on the Indian Secretary's powers was, however, rendered illusory by other clauses of the Act of 1858 *for the better government of India*, which enabled him to elude the apparent restraint.

To the virtually irresponsible power thus entrusted to the Indian Secretary was due the revival of the condemned policy which had resulted in the Afghan war of 1838-42, and involved us again in an Afghan war equally disastrous to British prestige and British interests. To the same irresponsible power was due the revival of the unfortunate policy which had resulted in our great troubles of 1857-58, and was pursued afterwards in entire disregard of the pledges given in the Royal Proclamation of 1858, in which our Queen, addressing the people of India in the name of the British nation, said: "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessings of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

How far the Secretary of State charged with redeeming the pledges then given by our Sovereign on that solemn occasion endeavoured to fulfil his duty faithfully and conscientiously, was shown in the debate on the conduct of the Indian Government towards the Mahárájá of Kashmir, which took place in the House of Commons on the 5th July, 1890. A *résumé* of that noteworthy debate will be found in the *Law Magazine and Review* of November, 1893.

The alarm and indignation of our Indian allies at the conduct of the British Government towards the young Mahárájá of Kashmir has since been intensified by the conduct of that Government towards other Indian princes. In the Kashmir case charges of treasonable conspiracy and intended murder were brought against the Mahárájá as grounds for depriving him of the administration of his State and of the bulk of his revenues. The Mahárájá at once

denounced these charges as false and the documentary evidence adduced in their support as forgeries, and he demanded an enquiry into their alleged truth. Whereupon the charges were dropped without the enquiry asked for being granted.

The two disastrous wars mentioned above, and the equally unsuccessful expeditions sent for the subjugation of trans-frontier tribes, burdened the Indian Exchequer with heavy additions to the public debt, and increased taxation was imposed for defraying the interest of the new loans contracted. The land tax, from which the largest item of Indian revenue is derived, was enhanced so excessively that its collection is marked by cruel severities, as was stated in Parliament in the form of questions, to which the Government promised answers pending a reference to India, but has not given them as yet, although two years have since elapsed.

The Moplahs, being cultivators of land in private estates, are not directly liable for the land tax claimed by the Government; but they have been drawn within the sphere of the fiscal severities practiced in the Madras Presidency, through an enactment of the Government which—superseding the traditional law which protected them from arbitrary enhancements of rent—compelled their landlords to enforce excessive rents with the aid of the Executive and the British tribunals, in order that they might be in a position to satisfy the arbitrarily enhanced demands of the Government. The Moplahs, when stripped of their savings and unable any longer to pay the increased rents for which they were prosecuted, turned against the British officials whom they identified as their actual oppressors; and the country has since been in a chronic state of disturbance. The public has repeatedly been told that the Moplah outbreaks were due, not to any action of the Government in connexion with the land tax, but to religious fanaticism alone; but the well-informed organ of the Indian Civil Service, *The Pioneer*, takes a very different view of the question, as the following extract will show:—

> "It is all very well to say that these recurring outbreaks are the result of pure religious fanaticism; but a deeper acquaintance with the subject will show that the Moplahs are men of strong religious feeling who make religion the channel through which their discontent finds escape. From whatever cause the Moplah does resort to arms, his Islamik principles compel him to die fighting against the Christian kafirs under whose sway he lives; for thus only is heaven assured and death is a release from the weariness of life in the present. Mr. Logan (the chief official in the district) undoubtedly lays his finger on the irritating sore when he says that the discontent is due to the oppressions and exactions of the system of land tenure; he says in effect 'give opportunities to the Moplahs, who are thrifty and industrious, to become prosperous, and they will become law-abiding.' In 1884, after the outbreak in Arcadekade, Mr. Logan urged upon the Government the adoption of measures in view of placing the land tenure system upon an improved footing, but nothing has been done to give practical effect to his suggestion."—*Pioneer*, March 25th, 1896.

The case of the Moplahs is the case of the cultivators throughout British India; for the burdens upon land have been oppressively increased everywhere, in order to provide for the growing military expenditure of the Government. The suffering and discontent engendered in these circumstances constitute a political danger which threatens to become imminent whenever complications in other parts of the world necessitate the removal from India of any material number of the British troops on whom we now rely for the safety of our Indian territories.

FRONTIERS AND FINANCE.

[BY AN INDEPENDENT POLITICIAN.]

The enquiring publicist is no doubt an official nuisance, if he may be a public benefactor. His supposed impertinence may be a national service, because there are many matters which the ordinary official wishes to express in his own way, if not to disguise. It is particularly so in Indian matters, and hence investigation is rendered the reverse of easy, and the investigator is considered a bore, whose motives are to be decried and whose path is to be strewn with the difficulties which constitute the attractions of an "obstacle race." I know no subject less easy to master than that which touches the frontier policy in India for the last twenty years, or ever since we abandoned the policy of masterly inactivity for that of ambitious muddle. It does not seem too hard to suggest that several persons are concerned in the art of mystification and misleading, in order to repel enquiry and to sustain a policy that would be unmistakably condemned if it could be studied clearly and consecutively in common with any other branch of Imperial policy and administration.

When a publicist is assured that the old school of Lawrence was a mistake, and that untold benefits have arisen from the acceptance of more progressive ideas, he naturally asks in what Parliamentary or Indian papers the forward frontier policy can be found clearly stated in its historical, military, financial and commercial bearings. Some returns and reports there are bearing on the subject, but they are not intended to be particularly intelligible. Surely this is a blunder of the first magnitude. Either the policy in question can be so expounded and defended, or it cannot. In the one case, there ought to be no attempt at confusion and secrecy; in the other, the arts of concealment, partial or obvious, become logical and natural, though eminently unsatisfactory.

It may be asked why anyone should desire to look at this matter in a common-sense way. The answer is that, if we are invited to approve, we are insulted if we are not entitled to understand. The forward frontier policy may be the best thing India has ever had since the government passed into Imperial hands. But, at any rate, it ought to bear investigation, and the facts connected with it ought to be found clearly arranged in State papers. Admiration based on ignorance is not worth much. It is the main thing required of Imperial politicians. Most of us are eager to acknowledge merit and genius where we can detect it. The world is not over-rich in splendid statesmanship and military strategy, and we are too ready to acknowledge their existence to rule India out of our sphere of observation and eulogy. Accordingly, it seems a great mistake

claim so much for this special policy, to tell us so little about it, and to brand as cheap economists or mean patriots or would-be revolutionists the persons who desire to be in quite as good a position to come to conclusions as the champions and fuglemen of the new frontier policy. It is a poor test of success when officialism starts the cheering, and will not let us know for what we are to cheer.

Why is not some specially competent statesman or military staff officer entrusted with the task of giving the natives of India and the people of Great Britain a succinct account of the different frontier expeditions of recent years, in a frank and careful manner? We want to know how they arose, what objects were aimed at, what they cost in men and money, and what are the net results from the military, financial, and commercial and political standpoints. If they will not bear such handling, there must be something about them that is not entirely satisfactory. Of course, we know as much as that in some cases, but the surface lessons might be more deeply imprinted under the weight of official knowledge, and perhaps there might be less reason for bragging and bluster in certain quarters. I know there are one or two papers bearing on the points in question, but they are inexact, insufficient, and they leave out material points in the story. The information desired should be much more minute than any yet given. It should include subsidies, the extra cost of political agents, the improvement of roads, the effect of success or failure upon trade and kindred matters. Nothing should be concealed. But as it is, to conceal as much as possible is thought good form.

When the above work has been done we could arrive at a judgment on the question as to whether the finances of India owe the greater part of their muddle and embarrassment to these exploits. "Yes," replies the official apologist, "you want us to prove your case." I answer for myself and a considerable class in England: "We have no theory one way or the other. We have but suspicions, and we want the truth. It is your policy, and it is for you to defend it." But beyond this statistical part, we desire to know whether India is really any safer or feels more secure, or is less liable to panic because of these forward frontier movements. If this cannot be fairly well established then the money spent has been wasted, more or less, with little to show for it. The case of Quetta is perhaps a strong one, because it lies outside our ordinary Indian frontier. Is there much else to show from the purely strategic point of view? For example, does the occupation of Chitral relative to some bigger movement prove to be of any better value than the occupation of Gilghit did in view of trouble in Chitral? As to popular opinion, it may be despised, but it must be considered. I am not sure that it has been soothed. But what do the forward men care? They talk of bazaar gossip when they want to justify a forward move, and despise it when it becomes a question as to the popular effect of that move. The largest benefit obtained from such advances as have been made is perhaps to be found in limiting the area about which military men can talk or work themselves up into contentions and contagious fever.

The cost to India of the forward frontier policy of the last eighteen years has been put at thirty millions and a half of English money. The sum includes operations in Egypt and Burma, but how they are to be ruled out I cannot see. India has three frontiers, (1) a normal frontier, (2) a forward frontier, and (3) a fanciful frontier. The last reaches from the Red Sea, westward, to Mekong, eastward. If all three kinds of expenditure were fairly stated, the sum named above would be largely exceeded. Now, the business man would have imagined that expenditure would have begun on frontier No. 1, instead of first reaching the other two, and have been largest thereon. Is that the fact? Sir Henry Brackenbury recently stated that the coast defences of Karachi, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, and Rangoon had been completed, and the bridge heads at Sukkur and Attock, on the Indus, finished. Forts at Rawal Pindi were making progress, but were not yet armed. Now, all these constructions have been subsequent in time and policy to the forward frontier movement. They thus prove its military insufficiency, because the normal frontier has had to be defended, in spite of the boast that by extending the frontier such works could be avoided—the early claim of the forward school. Financially, therefore, we seem to come to these points: that much of our money has been wasted on No. 2, and perhaps on No. 3; that after all we have had to spend money sequentially on No. 1, and conceal the process; and (3) that native and English opinion would at any time, on reason being shown, have sanctioned legitimate expenditure on frontier No. 1 without grumbling.

Here let me remark that, speaking for myself and the independent class, it is a mistake to say that we grudge the money to make India strong. Cheap sneers about weak politicians who object to military expenditure are beside the mark. The money for actual and not imaginary defence can always be found. It is money well spent. Take out the eighteen millions of money in English pounds spent in Afghanistan, and see how far it would have gone in building and arming the coast and Indus defences! It would have paid for the entire work and left money in hand for army improvements.

It is further to be borne in mind that forward frontier expenditure has weakened India for internal and natural frontier defence in other ways than the one I have just mentioned, though that is serious enough. "I believe there is no greater extravagance than to maintain a large army and to keep that army unready for war," remarked Sir Henry Brackenbury in speaking on the Military Budget. Now, it so happens that whilst money has been spent on frontier advances, it has not been spent on matters that wanted attention. I take mobilisation first. The first step in that reform began five years ago. It was then, as Sir Henry Brackenbury concedes, "only in embryo." Forty-nine and a half lakhs are to be spent in the coming year in these preparations. Take transport second: it is "our greatest difficulty in India," according to the same unquestionable authority. The Chitral campaign proved that transport arrangements were not what they ought to be. Here, then, are examples of an ambitious policy and

its effects. We extend our frontiers, and we do not proportionately strengthen, but weaken, the effective force of the army, because its readiness for action is neglected.

It will be said that this attack on the forward frontier school is inconsiderate and unjust. Does not such a complaint emphasise the necessity for some statement of the kind mentioned in a foregoing paragraph? I hold that it does; and I further contend that it shows the necessity for more caution in handling frontier questions and provoking frontier squabbles. I shelter myself, finally, behind Sir Henry Brackenbury's own admission as to the smaller and punitive frontier wars. In the recent Budget debate he said: "The past five years have been years of great difficulty for the Military Department. There have been a great number of frontier expeditions, which have upset our Budgets, and have been unwillingly concurred in by the Commander-in-Chief and myself." What a condemnation is this of some earlier and more costly frontier expeditions, wantonly forced, and leading to the abandonment of parts of so-called scientific frontiers!

MAGISTRATES ON TOUR.

By A. NUNDY.

There is one aspect of the question relating to the separation of judicial and executive functions in India which has not yet received the notice it deserves, causing as it does great hardship and annoyance. The criminal administration of justice, except in certain heinous offences, is in the hands of magistrates who are at the same time executive officers. As such it is their duty to go on tour for at least three months of the winter season. They have a variety of duties to perform, for the due discharge of which it is, no doubt, desirable that they should go on tour. But the Government is well aware, though it takes no notice, of the serious consequences to suitors who are compelled to resort to these magistrates. There is some sort of a rule that an official going on tour is to leave at headquarters a memorandum stating the particular places he will pass through on various dates. Such a memorandum may be left, but it is useless for practical purposes, as the itinerary may be changed at the will of the officer, or under circumstances over which he has no control. Take the district magistrate as an instance. Whilst on tour he receives information that a matter of the greatest urgency requires his presence at headquarters. He proceeds thither forthwith and after transacting his business returns to his camp, say, in a couple of days, and resumes his tour. But of course his former programme is entirely upset. Or it has begun to rain heavily, and, the roads becoming impassable, he is detained for three or four days. Or it may be that he is not successful in obtaining the *shikar* which had formed part of his programme, and he therefore defers his departure. It is well known that officers often remain several days in one spot, where there is a likelihood of obtaining sport, when, according to the memorandum they have left at headquarters, they ought to be miles away. Such a memorandum is therefore of little or no use.

What, then, is the consequence? Let us take a typical case. A person is desirous of filing a complaint before a magistrate. He goes to headquarters, and there learns that the magistrate will be at a certain village on the following day. He proceeds to this village and finds that the magistrate is not there, nor is he able to obtain any information as to when he is likely to arrive, or where he is to be found. He waits a day or two, and then learns that the magistrate has changed his route and will not visit that place at all. He then tries to ascertain the whereabouts of this official, and eventually finds his way to him. He institutes his complaint, and a date is fixed for the accused to attend and the witnesses for the prosecution to be heard, at a village called (let us say) B——. He returns to headquarters, and proceeds to the pleader, or *mukhtar*, whom he wishes to engage, and desires him to take up his case, which is to be heard on tour. Much to the suitor's surprise and disappointment, he finds that the legal practitioners either absolutely decline to go on tour, or ask such a sum for their services as is absolutely prohibitive to him, for he is not only required to pay a heavy fee per day, but also the travelling expenses, which, for a carriage specially hired or a palanquin, will be pretty high. He tries other pleaders and *mukhtars*, and often visits half a dozen, without being able to come to terms. As a last resource he engages a third-rate man, whom he would never have thought of engaging if the case had been heard at headquarters. On the appointed day he proceeds with his *mukhtar* and witnesses to the village B——, and learns to his chagrin that the magistrate is camped ten miles off. The *mukhtar* and the witnesses are willing to proceed further. The suitor is, therefore, obliged to open his purse and satisfy them, till at last he arrives at the magistrate's camp about noon, and finds that his case has been struck off in default. He presents himself before this functionary, who reprimands him sharply for being late; but, on the *mukhtar's* explaining the cause of the delay, and after much expostulation, the case is restored to the file and another date fixed for the hearing. Or it may happen that when the complainant arrives at the village B——, he finds that the magistrate has not yet arrived, but is shortly expected. He therefore waits, and in the course of the afternoon he sees that official take his seat in court. The magistrate takes up some executive or revenue work, or some *chalan* case (*i.e.*, a case sent up by the police), with the result that though the complainant waits about the court till 7 or 8 p.m., his case is never called on. He has, therefore, to seek for lodgings for the night for himself, his witnesses, and his *mukhtar*, to whom, of course, he has to pay another fee. Often the only lodging to be had is the shade of an adjacent tree, where, in the company of others equally unfortunate with himself, he seeks a well-earned repose. The next day the magistrate moves his camp a dozen miles further, and thither proceed in his train the unfortunate individuals who desire to have their wrongs redressed. Often the suitor becomes so weary of being dragged about from one place to another that he thinks the wisest thing

he can do is to compromise the matter with his opponent. It is by no means an uncommon event that persons who have suffered a wrong sit quietly and bear it, rather than resort to courts which, by the mode in which they administer justice, would inflict on them much greater suffering and injury.

But the offenders who are *chalaned* by the police are most to be pitied. A person is alleged to have caused grievous hurt to another. He is arrested by the police, who institute an enquiry, and then send him, together with the witnesses for the prosecution, to the magistrate who has jurisdiction to try the case. The police have some sort of idea that the magistrate is on tour, but they are ignorant as to the exact locality in which he is to be found. Sometimes they go in search of him, and sometimes they go on to headquarters, where they receive precise information where to find him. The prisoner is dragged about from place to place, and with him the witnesses, who usually accompany him, as they have signed a bond to appear before the magistrate, and the surest way to find him is to accompany the police. The prisoners have, indeed, a hard time, often subsisting on parched grain, for they are not at liberty to cook for themselves, and they have no one who can do it for them. Often late in the evening they are taken ten or twelve miles to a police-station where they can be kept in custody, to be marched back again in the morning to the magistrate's camp. They are deprived of all legal aid, except such as can be obtained at the camp, for a few *mukhtars*, usually the most incompetent of their class, follow the camp of a magistrate. Often when prisoners would be allowed by the magistrate to be out on bail, they find it hard in such out-of-the-way places to discover anyone who will be willing to stand security for them.

As regards another class of cases, also, the grievance is great, and calls for immediate redress. The district magistrate not only tries important criminal cases, but he is also invested with appellate powers as regards the decisions of second and third-class magistrates. He may hear in a month 70 or 80 cases in appeal or revision. In most of these cases pleaders and *mukhtars* are engaged. But when he is on tour the aggrieved parties have often to do without any legal advice, notwithstanding the fact that some intricate points of law are involved in the case. The district magistrate, of all others, has the most onerous duties to perform. He is the chief administrative head of the district. He is responsible for the well-being of the district and for the due collection of the Government revenue, and naturally he devotes the best part of his time to his executive and revenue functions. Judicial work is to him an irksome and thankless task. Yet he has before him scores of cases in which the judgments and orders of subordinate courts have been brought to him on appeal. Is it to be wondered at if, under the pressure of other work, which is even greater whilst he is on tour, he is obliged to postpone these cases from day to day, so that frequently the term of imprisonment has expired against which the appeal had been filed? When he does take up the appeal, it is simply to go through it in a perfunctory manner, often just glancing at the record and passing the stereotyped order, "I see no grounds for interfering with this judgment. Appeal dismissed." Sometimes the district magistrate takes up the appeals late in the evening. Say there are twenty appeals. Of these five have been sent in by prisoners from the gaol, and fifteen have been filed by the accused in person or by their legal advisers. The names of these fifteen appellants are called out; eight are found to be present, either in person or through their pleaders. They are informed that their cases will be taken up on the next day or the day after. The seven appellants who are absent have their appeals dismissed in default. Seven cases have thus been decided in two minutes, and in the monthly return sent to the Government the magistrate gets credit for these cases as so much work done. Now remain the five appeals sent in by the prisoners in gaol. The clerk takes one up and reads ground number 1 of the appeal when he is interrupted by the judge, who says "That will do—I see it is the plea usually put forward by all appellants. Appeal dismissed." The clerk takes up another appeal which perhaps meets a similar fate. He takes up a third with the remark, "This is an appeal from the judgment of Babu or Munshi So-and-so." He is asked to read the judgment, or if it is in English the magistrate reads it for himself. If he confirms the judgment he gives the subordinate officer a sharp rebuke for the slipshod manner in which the case was tried, or observes that he had failed to inflict a sufficient punishment. If he decides to reverse the judgment he puts it on record that none but an idiot could have believed the evidence on which the conviction was based. The two remaining appeals are then summarily dismissed, with the result that in a quarter of an hour twelve cases have been disposed of. To English readers this may seem an exaggeration. But it is an every-day affair with district magistrates, especially when they are on tour. There are, of course, magistrates who faithfully discharge their duties, and others would do so, but that they have no time to spare. Their efficiency as district magistrates is not decided according to the judicial work done by them, but by the manner in which they have discharged their executive and revenue functions.

Another serious evil resulting from the district magistrate's tour is that in certain cases where persons have been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment by the subordinate courts, they would have had a chance of being let out on bail if the magistrate had been at headquarters, whereas days may now elapse before it would be possible to find him and obtain the requisite order. I need not enumerate further evils that arise from the conversion of judicial officers into peripatetic administrators of justice. There is not a single redeeming feature in the practice. All concerned have to suffer—the litigants, the office establishment, and the legal practitioners—while the magistrates themselves are made the reluctant instruments of inflicting a vast amount of suffering on others. The only person who is delighted, and who looks forward to the touring season, is the sporting magistrate. Even he might confess that it would be better if his udicial functions were taken away from him.

INDIA IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

There seems to be a growing desire among those who are interested in the welfare of India to see India represented in the House of Commons. Recent events have accentuated that desire. The fact need not create any surprise, least of all among Englishmen. England has generously provided the people of India with a liberal education, she has instilled and stimulated in their minds her own cherished ideas of liberty and self-government, and she has supplied a lofty ideal, the attainment of which is the aim and aspiration of many an educated Indian. The longing of Indians for some voice in the government of their country is not merely sentimental. Stern facts have forced upon Indians the conviction that they would thereby be advancing their best interests. The barriers which separate the governing classes from the people are of such a nature that those on whom the responsibility of government rests—often from the lack of adequate information, and sometimes from an absence of sympathy—are led to the committal of acts which are hurtful to the feelings and detrimental to the interests of the people. Occasionally it has happened that Anglo-Indian officials, situated as they are at present, have found it impossible to act impartially and without prejudice in deciding questions in which they have a personal interest. But, more than this, we have learned by experience that even the Government of India has not a free hand in the exercise either of its legislative or of its administrative functions, but that it is liable to be influenced, and even over-ruled, by the Secretary of State for India, who is himself subordinate to the British Parliament. It has happened, and may happen again, that when there is a consensus of opinion in India, when all classes, official and non-official, English and Indian, are united in demanding a certain measure, and the Government of India itself has acknowledged the justice and reasonableness of the demand, the Secretary of State chooses to ignore this unanimous expression of opinion. The case of the import duties on cotton goods affords a notable example of this danger. In 1894 the Government of India had to face a heavy deficit of about 250 lakhs of rupees. It resorted to every possible expedient to raise the amount. The provincial balances were placed under requisition—involving the cessation of administrative improvements under the local governments; public works sanctioned by the Government of India were brought to a standstill by the diversion of the money which was to be applied to them; and the Famine Insurance Fund was swallowed up. Yet the deficit was not made good, and, under these circumstances, India with united voice asked for the imposition of a duty on all imported articles. Europeans and Indians, officials and non-officials, joined in making the demand. The duties were imposed, but cotton goods were exempted. The non-official members of the Viceregal Council, European and Indian, voted in a body against the exemption. The official members voted for it, but under protest. The members of the India Council recorded minutes of dissent. But the *fiat* of the Secretary of State for India carried the day. It is not, therefore, surprising that the conviction should have forced itself upon the minds of many thoughtful persons that to secure for ourselves an effectual hearing an agitation confined within India alone is of no avail, but that our views should in some manner be represented directly to the people of the United Kingdom and their Parliament.

Recent events have confirmed us in this belief. For years we in India agitated in vain for the expansion and the reform of the Councils. But when Mr. Bradlaugh took up the question in the House of Commons the desired boon (though in a modified form) was soon granted. For the last two decades there has been an unceasing cry that a Commission should be appointed to investigate the expenditure incurred, and the revenue obtained, by the Government of India. This cry met for a long time with no response. But of late years India has had the good fortune to secure some doughty champions in the House of Commons in Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and others, with the result that a Royal Commission is now engaged upon a portion, at any rate, of the desired investigation. Yet it was, so to say, by accident that India secured the support of a number of Members of Parliament of considerable weight and influence, and now, as ill luck will have it, many of these members have lost their seats in the House of Commons. How much better, therefore, would it be for us if, in addition to these friends in need, we could send our own representatives from India.

It may perhaps be said that we have our Legislative and Provincial Councils and that we should content ourselves with expressing our views in these assemblies. But the free expression of our views is not expected or tolerated by the officials. On the other hand, it is resented, as, for example, in the case of Mr. P. M. Mehta, in the Viceregal Council, in the debate on the Police Amendment Bill. The exercise of the right of interpellation—a boon generously granted by the British Parliament—is looked upon with horror by Governors holding autocratic views, like Sir Charles Elliott, who discourage it in every possible way and, by giving evasive answers, render a valuable privilege almost nugatory. To expect further reform in the constitution of our Councils, and extension of the privileges connected with them, is at present, I am afraid, out of the question. But even if we were placed on a better footing in the Councils, of what practical value would the change be to us? The elected members can never expect to be in a majority. They must be outvoted by the official and the nominated members. It is only public opinion in the United Kingdom and the authority of Parliament that can effectually redress our grievances. Hence it is that we desire that India should be represented in Parliament.

The proposal is doubtless a large one, and there are difficulties in the way. It may be condemned by some as raising a question that is beyond the range of practical politics. It will, perhaps, be said that no measure could be formulated for the representation of India in Parliament, unless it were part of a comprehensive scheme by which a similar privilege

was granted to the colonies and other British dependencies, and that for this privilege no demand is made on their part. But the reason for their contentment is obvious. The tendency in these days is towards self-government. British colonies prefer self-government to sending representatives to a foreign Parliament which could legislate on their domestic affairs. The time is not far distant when Ireland will obtain a Parliament to legislate on Irish local affairs. A similar privilege granted to Scotland and Wales would, it is contended by some whose opinions carry weight, operate as much to the benefit of those countries as to the advantage of the Imperial Parliament, which is at present unable to devote due time and attention to its accumulation of business. How, then, if a solution of the difficulty were found in the formation of a Home Rule Parliament in England to deal with English affairs? It might then be practicable to constitute a new Imperial Parliament composed of representatives from England, Ireland and Wales and the several colonies and dependencies desiring to be represented in it, or to whom it would be desirable to grant representation. The colonies possess at present their own Parlialiaments, which legislate on their own particular concerns, in respect of which they would not tolerate interference on the part of England. These colonies, as matters stand at present, have no desire to be represented in a Parliament in which they might be called upon to legislate on matters in which they have no special or direct interest, but they would not have the same objection to forming part of an assembly whose sole function it would be to deal with Imperial affairs. To such an assembly India might well claim the privilege of sending representatives, without laying itself open to the objection that might with good reason be put forward by the English people against allowing foreigners—as they sometimes misname their Indian fellow-subjects—with an imperfect knowledge of their needs, habits and customs, to legislate on their domestic affairs.

When such a Parliament could be constituted is for the future to decide. Meantime it is due to the British nation to acknowledge the generosity of which they have given two notable instances within the last few years. They have shown that they are above race prejudices in this matter, and that they are prepared to elect as their own representatives in the House of Commons Indians who have taken up their residence in England, or frequently visit England, and are conversant with English desires and aims—for I take it that, but for the general revulsion of feeling in favour of the "Unionists," Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee would have been elected last summer by the Liberals at Barrow, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was elected in 1892 by the Liberals of Central Finsbury. What we ought, therefore, at present to look forward to is the chance of Indians of education and position settling down in England, and being selected as candidates for British constituencies. To such candidates it is the duty of all who are interested in the progress of India to lend hearty support—provided always that they come to England fortified with credentials showing that they possess the confidence of the people of India.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

When Sir W. Wedderburn rose to move the adjournment of the House of Commons on May 18, in order to call attention to Lord G. Hamilton's recent re-arrangement of the Indian cotton duties, he was supported by a large number of members. The whole of the Opposition, except the Front Bench, rose in their places.

It is not usual for the Front Bench to support a motion for adjournment, but Mr. T. Shaw, the late Solicitor-General for Scotland, acted on this occasion with the rank and file of the Liberal party. It was remarked that not even a solitary Ministeralist joined in the effort to secure a hearing for the complaints of India.

Sir W. Wedderburn rose from the top corner seat of the second bench below the gangway. On the bench behind him were Mr. John Dillon and Mr. Michael Davitt, and on the bench before him, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Labouchere. There was, except on the Front Benches, a fairly good attendance of members throughout the debate. Sir Henry Fowler's speech, which provoked much angry comment among Liberal members, afforded Mr. Balfour an excuse for moving the closure, and the Speaker an excuse for suggesting that the motion should forthwith be withdrawn.

The present Government, as Sir W. Harcourt says, lives upon closure. But the responsibility in this instance lay chiefly with Sir H. Fowler who, after a consultation with Lord George Hamilton behind the Speaker's chair, deliberately and vehemently attacked a motion which the fighting strength of his party had agreed in supporting. It was certainly an odd position for a Liberal leader whose policy had been reversed by his successor.

The effect of Sir H. Fowler's intervention was to closure many members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee who were prepared, and had intended, to speak. But the discussion was not altogether fruitless. Besides directing public attention to the question of the cotton duties, and securing from Lord G. Hamilton a promise to produce the minutes of members of the India Council, it extracted from Mr. Balfour what amounts to an honourable pledge that the Indian Budget shall be brought on at a time when it can be "adequately" discussed.

The following are the terms of the motion of which Lord George Hamilton has given notice with reference to the expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan: "That Her Majesty having directed a military expedition of Her Native forces charged upon the revenues of India to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops, this House consents that the ordinary pay of any troops so despatched, as well as the ordinary charges of any vessels belonging to the Government of India that may be employed in this expedition, which would have been charged upon the resources of India if such troops or vessels had remained in that country or seas adjacent, shall continue to be so chargeable: Provided that if it shall become necessary to replace the troops or vessels so withdrawn by other vessels

or Native forces, then the expense of raising, maintaining, and providing such vessels and forces shall, in so far as may not be otherwise provided, be repaid out of any moneys which may be provided by Parliament for the purposes of the said expedition."

According to Mr. Balfour's announcement on the eve of the Whitsuntide recess, the motion will be submitted on Thursday, June 4th. Notice has been given of the following amendments :—

Mr. John Morley:

Line 2, leave out all after "That," and insert "it is inexpedient that any portion of the charges of the Indian force that is being despatched to Africa in aid of Egyptian troops, whether ordinary charges or extraordinary, should be imposed upon the revenues of India."

Mr. Buchanan:

Line 2, leave out all after "That," and insert "in the opinion of this House, no part of the cost of the troops in Africa in aid of Egyptian troops should be charged upon the revenues of India."

Mr. Maclean:

Line 4, leave out all after "troops," and insert "this House is of opinion that no portion expenses, ordinary or extraordinary, of the troops employed in this expedition should, during their absence from India, be charged upon the Indian revenues."

The question would probably have been raised on a motion for adjournment before the Whitsuntide recess, had not Mr. Sydney Gedge, on May 13th, given notice of a "blocking" motion. He has undertaken, on an early day, "to call attention to the action of the Government in employing Indian troops in the Sudan; and to move a resolution." Mr. Sydney Gedge's interest in India is a somewhat uncertain quantity. But he was able, by employing the forms of the House, to prevent discussion of the question, and therefore—whether intentionally, or not—to accommodate the Government.

It is officially announced that "the Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Hungerford Tudor Boddam, barrister-at-law, to be a Judge of the High Court at Madras, in the place of Mr. George Arthur Parker, who has been permitted to retire."

The list of birthday honours published on May 20th contained the announcement that Her Majesty had been pleased to direct that Professor Max Müller be sworn a member of the Privy Council.

Professor Max Müller, is well known as a distinguished philological and Oriental scholar. He is a son of Wilhelm Müller, the German poet, and was born at Dessau in 1823. He studied in Berlin, Leipzig, and Paris, and in 1846 he came to England to collate MSS. at the East India House and the Bodleian Library. He was on the point of returning to Germany when the late Baron Bunsen, then Prussian Minister in London, persuaded him to stay, and the East India Company engaged him to publish the first edition of the Rig-Veda at their expense. In 1848 he settled at Oxford. He was elected Taylorian Professor in 1854, and a Fellow of All Souls in 1858. In 1868 the University founded a Chair of Comparative Philology to which he was nominated in the deed of foundation.

Professor Max Müller is not the first Oxford Professor who has been elected to the dignity of a Privy Councillor while still in the active discharge of the duties of his Chair in the University. In 1871 the late Mr. Montagu Bernard, who was Chichele Professor of International Law at Oxford, was, on his return from Washington, where he had gone as one of the High Commissioners for the settlement of the "Alabama claims," sworn of the Privy Council in recognition of his learning and public services.

Among the birthday honours the dignity of Knighthood was conferred upon the Hon. George Arthur Parker, late Judge of the High Court, Madras. The following promotions and appointments were announced from the India Office:—To be Knights Commanders of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India—William Erskine Ward, C.S.I., Chief Commissioner of Assam, and Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Alfred Swaine Lethbridge, M.D., C.S.I.; to be a Companion, James Fairbairn Finlay, Secretary to the Government of India in the Finance and Commerce Department; to be Companions of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire—Henry O'Connell Cardozo, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, Madras; Brigade - Surgeon - Lieutenant - Colonel Benjamin Franklin; Thomas Higham, Chief Engineer and Secretary to the Government of the Punjab in the Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch; Major John Shakespear, D.S.O., Leinster Regiment; Sardar Ratan Singh, President of the Council of Regency of the Jind State; Raja Bhup Indra Bikram Singh, of Piagpur; Major (Honorary Lieutenant-Colonel) James John Macleod, Officiating Commandant Behar Light Horse; Captain Norman Franks; Arthur Henry Plunkett; and Rao Bahadur Chunilal Venilal.

The popularity of the Empire of India Exhibition, the most attractive of the many exhibitions held at Earl's Court, was by no means exhausted when its doors were closed last autumn, and it is not surprising that its principal features have been preserved in the Empire of India and Ceylon Exhibition, opened to the public on May 9th. The ingenuity of Mr. Imre Kiralfy has also provided new features, which promise to make "India and Ceylon" even more successful than its predecessor. Chief among these is a fine panorama of ancient Rome, which had already been exhibited at some of the principal cities on the Continent. The canvas measures 349 feet in circumference, and is 50 feet high. The scene, realistic as a living picture, represents the Eternal City as it appeared in A.D. 312, when Constantine made his triumphal entry. Craftsmen from various parts of the Indian Empire, from the Himalaya to the Point de Galle, are located in the "Indian City," and the little workshops which line the streets attract crowds of sightseers curious to observe the primitive tools of the Indian or Cingalese artificer and ready to marvel at his patient skill. Towering above the "City" is the "Great Wheel"—distinctly a product of Western ideas. The educational side of the exhibition is represented also by collections of curiosities and the like from Northern India, Nepal, Ceylon and the Straits Settlements. The exhibition will doubtless prove to be one of the chief attractions of the summer season in London.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JUNE, 1896.

THE PREDOMINANT PARTNER.

"Her Majesty's Government propose that the ordinary pay and allowances of the Indian native troops under orders for Suakin should continue to be borne by the revenues of India."—Lord G. HAMILTON, May 15th, 1896.

"I have been able, with the assistance of the Indian Government, to come to a solution the equity of which no human being can dispute. *It has been accepted in Lancashire*, and, so far as I know, *whatever agitation there was in India* has altogether died out."—Lord G. HAMILTON on the Cotton Duties, May 18th, 1896.

"Every member of this House, whether elected by an English, or by a Scotch, or by an Irish constituency, is a member for India."—Sir H. H. FOWLER, February 21st, 1895.

THE Parliamentary Report issued with the present number of INDIA illustrates, with almost dramatic completeness, one of the gravest dangers which exist side by side with the undoubted and manifold benefits of British rule in India. It is the danger that India should at times be governed, or, at any rate, seem to be governed, not in the interests of India (which has no votes), but in the interests of the United Kingdom (which has). On May 18th Sir W. Wedderburn moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to show how that Lord George Hamilton's recent re-arrangement of the Indian cotton duties—a re-arrangement suggested by Lancashire and eminently satisfactory to Lancashire—had increased the burdens of Indian taxpayers, and especially of the poorest classes. The motion was withdrawn under threat of the closure. Lord George Hamilton refused to accede in any degree to the unanimous request of public opinion in India. Meantime, on May 11th and subsequent days, he and his colleagues had been engaged in evading questions as to the expenses of the Indian troops who have been despatched to the Sudan by the British Government. After a good deal of ambiguity and procrastination, it was at last admitted that the poverty-stricken taxpayers of India would be required to pay the ordinary expenses of the troops whose services had been borrowed by her prosperous rulers. To complete the story, and the moral, we have only to reflect that the cotton duties were re-imposed on account of the financial difficulties of the Government of India, and that those financial difficulties were undoubtedly due chiefly to extravagant military expenditure. That is to say, (1) we impose an excessive military establishment and a "forward" frontier policy upon the taxpayers of India; (2) we sanction the re-imposition of cotton duties in order to save their Government, impoverished by our military schemes and methods, from open insolvency; (3) at the bidding of Lancashire we readjust the cotton duties in a way which excites vehement and widespread indignation in India; and then (4) we calmly borrow Indian troops, at the expense of the Indian revenues, to conduct our military operations in the Sudan. And yet, in the beautiful words of Sir Henry Fowler, every member of the House of Commons is a member for India!

The proceedings of the Government with reference to the Indian troops have, as will be seen from the extracts printed on another page, provoked much unfavourable comment in English newspapers. What sort of comment are they likely to produce in India? A telegram dated Simla, May 10th, briefly announced that native troops were to be sent to Suakin for garrison duty. On the following day, and again on May 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 18th, and 19th questions on the subject were addressed to various members of the Government, and the several answers vouchsafed to them betrayed a really alarming degree of carelessness, and even levity, in dealing with a grave Imperial question. The Government, it would seem, had not deemed the matter to be worth serious discussion. Lord George Hamilton airily informed Mr. Morley that the expenses of the Indian troops would be divided between the British Government and the Government of India. The words were no sooner out of his mouth than the Chancellor of the Exchequer warned Mr. Labouchere that it would, nevertheless, be wrong to infer that the expenses were not to be borne by the Egyptian Government. Mr. Balfour added that they would be divided between the three Governments. On the important constitutional question whether a resolution to permit the employment of the troops would be submitted to Parliament, there was a similar variety of impromptu opinions. Lord George Hamilton, who might have been expected to know something of the Act of 1858, declared that such a resolution was unnecessary. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach seemed to think it was necessary. Finally, Mr. Balfour gave the House to understand that a resolution would be submitted as a matter of courtesy, not as a matter of law. This confusion of tongues is astounding. The

Government had evidently decided at some date prior to May 10th to employ Indian troops in the Sudan. But it had not taken Parliament into its confidence, and when private members asked questions the answers only revealed the uncertainty or the nescience of the Cabinet. Even when the Government had undertaken to submit the necessary resolution, Mr. Balfour, who is one of the most casual of men, seemed to think that it might suitably be used as a mere lever to expedite discussion on the Agricultural Rating Bill. It was ultimately postponed until the House re-assembles after the Whitsuntide recess and, according to Mr. Balfour's latest forecast, the resolution, of which Lord George Hamilton has given notice, will be discussed on Thursday, June 4th. The indifference with which Ministers were prepared to over-ride the law and to ignore precedent is characteristic of the temper in which they have borrowed the troops. The pity of it is that there *is* a precedent for borrowing Indian troops at the expense of India. In New Zealand in 1860 and 1861, in the Abyssinian expedition of 1867, in the Perak expedition of 1875, in Afghanistan in 1878, in Egypt in 1882, and in the Sudan in 1885, the predominant partner compelled a loan on these inequitable terms, which, it goes without saying, are never conceded in the converse case. In all these cases except two India was required to pay the ordinary expenses of the borrowed troops. The exceptions were in 1878 and in 1882 when India defrayed the whole cost of the operations, receiving, however, a grant of £5,000,000 in the first case and of £500,000 in the second. There are, however, two further exceptional cases of a more creditable type. When we borrowed Indian troops for the China expedition in 1859-60, and for Malta in 1878, we were handsome enough to pay the bill. It would be interesting to know, and the Government ought to be asked, on what principle, if any, the differentiation is made. The question can, as it happens, be put without reference to comparatively ancient history. Lord George Hamilton announced in almost one and the same breath on May 15th that India would bear no charge for the troops borrowed for Mombasa, though she would be required to pay the ordinary expenses of the troops borrowed for the Sudan. Where does the difference come in? Is it all a matter of caprice, or is the Cabinet acting upon an intelligible, though inscrutable, plan?

What has India to do with the Sudan or with Egypt, for whose benefit, according to Lord Salisbury, the present expedition has been undertaken? It may be said that India, as a part of the British Empire, is interested in all Imperial undertakings. Even so, it would hardly follow that she should pay for them. But if this argument were seriously employed it would have to be addressed, as it is not, to the Colonies as well. There is a simple and obvious test of the fairness or unfairness of charging to India the expenses of her borrowed troops. If we had sent out an equal number of troops from England to do the same work, should we have thought of placing *their* expenses upon India? The question needs only to be stated, and the notion is seen to be preposterous. Yet the proposal of the Cabinet is not essentially different. The taxpayers of India maintain their enormous army on the ground, or the theory, that it is necessary for their protection. When we borrow a portion of that protection, and thereby reduce it, the really equitable course would be not only to pay all the expenses of the borrowed portion, but also to compensate India for the temporary loss. The truth is that the thing does not admit of argument. When British troops are sent to India their expenses, from the moment of embarkation, are paid by India. More than that, India, as Mr. Hanbury has more than once remarked with something very like indignation, pays a heavy annual contribution to the War Office on account of the training of recruits in the United Kingdom. Some admirers of the Government approve its present proposal on the ground that, as they say, India does not pay for the British Fleet. Yet it is notorious that India pays, and pays heavily, for every vessel which human ingenuity can assign to her share. Considerations like these are, we may be very sure, present to the minds of educated Indians, and, to put it mildly, are not exactly conducive to gratitude or respect. The Simla correspondent of the *Times*, who is not likely to be accused of excessive sympathy with Indian opinion, telegraphed on May 21st that a strong feeling prevailed that the pay and allowances of troops withdrawn from India for service which in no way concerned India should be borne by the Home Government. "India loses the services "of her regiments temporarily. She will have to pay "the pensions of Sepoys who die. She does not "benefit in the least by the expedition into the "Sudan, and she can ill afford to weaken the "garrison now that heavier responsibilities have "been incurred by the occupation of an advanced "strategic position at Chitral and in other parts of "of the North-West frontier." Precisely, and the Simla correspondent of the *Times*, might have added that the occupation of those advanced strategic positions was, and is, a costly business undertaken by Englishmen in defiance of the Indian taxpayer, but at their expense. One thing is certain. An incident like the present is not regarded in India as the result of reasoned debate. It is regarded with bitterness as a mere exercise of superior and selfish force, and, therefore, it strikes at the roots of popular loyalty and British authority. The compulsory loan of Indian troops for the Sudan suggests many questions much larger than itself. The writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times*, who believes that the decision now to be given "may do more than "any other action taken by the British Parliament "since the mutiny of 1857 to confirm or to shake "the loyalty of India," points out that in tropical and sub-tropical Africa the employment of Indian troops may become a permanent necessity. But that is not the whole of the matter. The contention of educated Indians is that, in very many important departments of Indian administration and policy, India—to employ Lord Salisbury's expressive term —is "bled" for the benefit of the United Kingdom. It is greatly to be regretted that our Government should lend colour to this accusation:

> "Pudet hœc opprobria nobis
> Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli."

LORD G. HAMILTON'S DEFENCE.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to the Memorial of the Indian Parliamentary Committee touching the re-arrangement of the cotton duties, and his defence of the existing imposts in the House of Commons on May 18th, are specimens of reasoning well worthy of the cause they are intended to serve. The argument from protection which has been so frequently combated is again paraded as an excuse for the transference of the duties from yarns to manufactured goods. "It was considered," Lord G. Hamilton says, "that the best way of relieving the trade (Indian as "well as foreign) from artificial restrictions, and of "excluding all semblance of protection, would be to "make all yarns altogether free of duty and to place "a duty on all woven goods." The proposal sounds plausible. But its fallacious character becomes evident at once on examination. The semblance of protection—an appropriate term—here alluded to is obviously the one and a half per cent. which, Lancashire manufacturers stated, was saved by the Indian mills in paying duty on yarns instead of on manufactured goods. When the tax on machinery and other necessities of manufacture is estimated it will be found, as Mr. Hume and others have pointed out, that this small margin, this semblance of protection, is reduced to vanishing point. Moreover by the new duty on manfactured goods the hand-looms as against the power-looms must secure at least the same degree of protection as that which Indian looms secured against Lancashire looms under the previous system. But "Lord George Hamilton does "not share the expectation that the 3½ per cent. "duty on mill-woven goods will enable hand-looms "to compete successfully with power-mills or to "reduce the demand for mill-made cloth." And in this question, unfortunately, Lord George Hamilton's will is law. But it would be interesting to learn whether he considers this opinion consistent with the view that the "semblance of protection" afforded by the old duties could enable Indian mills to compete successfully with old-established and more efficient Lancashire looms. But, he argues, though "the "difference was not very substantial, there was "theoretically a case for protection." Why should he then be so eager to avoid all appearance of evil when the interests of Lancashire are threatened, yet insist that before an Indian grievance is remedied it should be proved by practical experience to be capable of working serious mischief? It surely needs no very highly developed sense of equity to perceive the injustice of basing all one's constructive arguments on practice and all one's destructive arguments on theory, or *vice versa*, in such a way as to gain on both aspects of the discussion the benefit of any discrepancy which may exist between theory and fact.

The sentiment about freeing the foreign trade from artificial restrictions by removing the duty from yarns is intended to tickle the ears of Free Traders. But its value cannot be estimated by its conformity with the absolute standard of economic truth. It must be tested by reference solely to the arrangement which it superseded. By that arrangement yarns below 20's were exempt from duty. Now it has never been disputed that Indian cotton is utterly unsuited for yarns of higher counts, and so the exemption of yarns of lower counts left India's export trade of yarns unfettered. How, then, does the supersession of the previous arrangement improve matters? It will hardly be contended that India can re-export to Eastern markets the higher counts imported from Lancashire and compete with direct exports from Lancashire to the East. On no other supposition can the change be reasonably asserted to have benefited India. The true reason for the revision of the tax must be sought not in economic but in political considerations. On this point the manufacturers of India, whom Sir J. Leng quoted, shrewdly divined the truth. The vote of the Lancashire members, combined to claim exemption from the impost levied on all other exporters to India, was sufficient to shake even the present Tory position. On the other hand, it was found impossible in view of India's financial difficulties to fulfil the promises of repeal held out by the Tory party before the General Election. Accordingly, this compromise between necessity and injustice was devised, whereby a sop was given to Lancashire and the loss to the Indian Budget covered by increasing the extent of the incidence of the tax, so as to make it include even the clothes of the very poorest. And this offspring of Lord George Hamilton's ingenuity has actually received the patronage of Sir Henry Fowler, who quoted the speech of the Finance Minister to the effect that the mass of the Indian population would not be called upon to contribute more than half an anna on the average to the new duties, and the very poorest classes probably not more than a pie and a-half. "To speak of this as oppressive taxation," runs the quotation, "is a misuse of words." Surely Sir Henry Fowler has in his youth heard of the fallacy called sorites, and read of Horace's *ruentis acervi*. Or does he not grasp the fact that when the breaking strain of a bar is reached the addition of an ounce will produce an effect apparently quite disproportionate to the weight of the addition. It is impossible to credit him with such ignorance. We can only marvel at his support of a position which necessitates such subterfuges.

Less subtle and not less absurd is Lord George Hamilton's attempt to refute the contention that the 3½ per cent. duties involve the infliction of hardship on the poorest class. His argument is happily described by Sir W. Wedderburn as fantastic. "So "far as Lord George Hamilton is aware there is no "ground for believing that cotton goods woven "from yarns of 20's and under are used exclusively "or nearly exclusively by the poorest classes, "although it is undoubtedly the case that in India, "as in many other countries, the majority of the "population are poor." To take this fantastic argument in detail, in the first place there is an ambiguity in the use of the words "are used exclusively or nearly exclusively." If this means that the lowest counts are used by others than the poorest classes, the assertion is no doubt true, but absolutely beside the question. If on the other hand it means that the poorest classes do not confine themselves, or nearly confine themselves, to the use of the lowest counts, the assertion affects the

point at issue, indeed, but is a palpable mis-statement. The second part of the *apologia* is at first sight merely the cynical expression of a stupid platitude. Yet even this has its place in the tissue of false arguments and insinuations which has been woven round the question with the effect, if not the intention, of obscuring it. The term "poor" is one that requires definition, and one that is purely relative. No doubt the mass of the population all the world over is poor. But can any civilised country show an average income per head so low as the average income of the natives of India? Can any country in the whole world show a class of labourers so highly taxed in proportion to their income as the Indian rayat? Unless these two conditions are fulfilled, and it is further postulated that the aim of the Indian Government should be not to reach in its administration the highest standard of comfort for the people, but merely not to fall much below the lowest, the implied argument is as valueless as the rest. Lord George Hamilton would hardly confess to himself that he would be satisfied with a success so ignoble. Yet he resorts to arguments which involve such inferences merely in order to defend the amazing scheme which, by a crowning *petitio principii*, he describes as "the equitable "arrangement recently arrived at in connexion with "these duties."

STATE LANDLORDISM IN MADRAS.

WE desire to bring to the notice of all who are interested in the real facts of Indian Administration being laid before the public at home the perfunctory, not to say supercilious, manner in which questions put in Parliament with regard to such facts are answered by the Secretary of State. It will be remembered that on March 19th last Sir W. Wedderburn, on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, put certain questions to the Secretary of State for India, in which, after enquiries whether certain statistics with regard to evictions of tenants of the State, the sale of property of such tenants for much less than its real value, the large area of waste land, etc., and the delay for over three years of the Government of Madras in replying to a reference on the subject, were correct or not, he was asked whether he would cause special enquiry to be made with a view to an improved system of land revenue assessment and collection in the Madras Presidency. Lord G. Hamilton's answer was that he could not trace any reference to Madras evictions in Sir R. Temple's speech on the Indian Budget in 1892, a matter that had also been alluded to in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions. Was it for the purpose of throwing dust into people's eyes that he did not notice the fact of Sir R. Temple's having referred to those evictions in 1894, if he did not in 1892? In acknowledging that his predecessor (he did not say which predecessor, or that this was in the beginning of 1893) had asked the Government of Madras to report whether some improvement could not be introduced in the method of dealing with land revenue defaulters, he stated that that Government was considering the matter and hoped to report shortly, but he omitted to state that its promise to report was made fully a year and a-half ago. He went on to say that he had been able to identify some of the figures in the reports of the Madras Revenue Board, but that others appeared to be incorrect, and he would not trouble the House with remarks on all the figures quoted in the question. With regard to the correctness, we have explained on a former occasion that the only mistakes were made by the printers of the Parliamentary Papers in substituting 5 for 8 in two places, the substance of the questions being unchanged.

Now, the gist of the whole matter lay in the details of those very figures, which went to prove the evils of a system under which, for the realisation of the land revenue, thousands of the tenants of the State were annually evicted from their lands, having to pay interest on overdue instalments in addition to charges for process fees. These figures, taken from the official returns, showed that their property, personal as well as real, was put up to auction and sold for far less than its value, that of the real property thus put up for sale, a very large proportion had to be bought in on account of Government by the revenue

TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF EVICTIONS, ETC., IN MADRAS FROM 1883-4 TO 1893-4.

Years.	Total cultivated area in acres.	Total waste in acres.	Total notices of demand.	Total notices of sale.	Total defaulters whose property was sold.	Details of property sold.		Realised by actual sale.		Total number of acres sold.				Total wet and dry.	
						Estimated value of personal property.	Estimated value of real property.	Personal.	Real.	To Government.		To others.			
										Dry.	Irrigated.	Dry.	Irrigated.		
						Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.						
1883-84	19,326,907	...	...	...	130.714	362,156	464.586	272,998	480,822	88,167		101,770		189,937	
1884-85	19,438,274	...	...	...	63,610	248,232	206,859	234,586	241.657	34,552		36,433		70,990	366,967
1885-86	27,480,906	8,052,375	...	...	41,833	193,735	219,705	182,201	276,377	28,455		40,183		68,638	
1886-87	27,970,099	7,777,298	...	...	30,915	166,225	1,119,563	146,458	229,335	17,986		19,416		37,402	
1887-88	28,267,292	8,376,156	3,523,309	177,374	35,750	82,302	684,092	90,842	188,906	11,348	2,291	12,027	6,158	31,824	
1888-89	28,773,793	...	4,031,787	144,149	17,346	92,327	715,120	89,752	165,733	10.641	1,783	7,811	3,380	23,615	213,867
1889-90	28,770,031	8,021,292	4,073,688	140,620	11,339	104,621	501,177	96,017	111,085	12,235	1,551	13,678	4.211	31,675	
1890-91	28,878,498	7,869,272	3,983,067	115,934	10,115	67,233	531,837	59,216	119,365	7,711	1,635	9.406	3,018	21,770	
1891-92	28,823,826	7,964,605	4,128,184	156.969	11,118	74,730	512,989	60,899	100,641	7,924	1,715	8,146	2,488	20,273	
1892-93	29,241,343	7,709,658	4,914,683	159,554	12,400	67,742	596,756	58,384	138,552	12.876	1,792	11,636	3,922	30,226	
1893-94	29,597,272	6,992,817	5,374,303	209,517	14,198	83,310	715,612	53,876	155,762	23,470	2,122	24,566	4,326	54,484	
Total...	...	...	...	...	379,338	1,542,613	6,268,296	1,345,229	2,208,235	...	12,889	...	27,503	580,834	
						7,810,909		3,553,464			40,392				

authorities for want of bidders at the sales, and that in consequence of this system nearly 3½ millions of acres of assessed land were lying waste. To say the least of it, was it a statesmanlike proceeding to throw the public off the scent of the real object of Sir W. Wedderburn's interrogatories, viz., to expose the radical defects of the Madras land revenue system? We should rather like to know whether the Secretary of State was personally responsible in this matter, or whether his words were put into his mouth by his secretary in the revenue department. He concluded his remarks by saying that the number of evictions had fallen from 130,714 in 1883 to 10,115 in 1890. Was it for the purpose of still further throwing dust into the public eye that he omitted to notice the figures in the second portion of Sir W. Wedderburn's question, which proved that in the three subsequent years the evictions had increased by over 4,000?

As the correctness of the figures in the question had been impugned, Sir W. Wedderburn called for a Parliamentary return, embodying substantially all that he had already given. After delaying to accede to the request for this return for about a month, Lord G. Hamilton stated in the House of Commons that reference would have to be made to Madras before the figures could be made up. That this is not the case, our readers will be satisfied by an inspection of the accompanying statement, prepared from the official records of the India Office and the Indian Statistical Abstract, containing the actual figures asked for in the return. The public may judge for themselves whether a deliberate attempt has not been made to postpone, if not, in view of the dilatoriness of the Madras Government, to stifle enquiry.

MONEY AND THE MOVEMENT OF PRICES.[1]

The issue of 1768 publications on the monetary question between 1871 and 1891—these are the figures given in Dr. Soetbeer's bibliography—is a curious indication of the interest felt in the subject and of the diversity of opinion that it provokes. If all writers were as lucid, and all statisticians as impartial as Mr. Price, the old taunt which makes "statistics" a superlative of which "lies" and "—— lies" are only the positive and comparative, would lose its significance, and we should be brought nearer the solution of some difficult problems. Mr. Price is not in a hurry to prove too much. He understands that the economist really achieves more by being careful to lay sound foundations for others to build upon than by attempting to raise an imposing structure himself. It is not easy to pass such a self-denying ordinance, and, when you have succeeded, it is not pleasant to find that you are called "academic" in consequence, and accused of having more interest in abstractions than in your fellow-men. No little honour is due to those who deliberately set themselves to a task, of which few can appreciate the magnitude or the usefulness, for the sake of the greater ultimate good.

The present little work is the revised form of six lectures delivered by Mr. Price last year as Newmarch Lecturer in Statistics at University College, London. Its object is to determine precisely what the labours of economists have so far proved as to the connexion between the supply of the precious metals and the rise and fall of general prices. That money is not an absolute standard of value, but is itself liable to fluctuations, is a truth less likely to be forgotten now than formerly; the growing divergence between the values of silver and gold, in recent years, has made it abundantly clear. The first chapter describes the attempts made by economists to obtain a more stable standard for the measurement of prices—the "index numbers" of the *Economist* newspaper, of Mr. Palgrave, Sir R. Giffen, Mr. Sauerbeck and Dr. Soetbeer. The second chapter discusses the effect of rising and falling prices on landlords, workmen and employers. The influence of imagination on trade is incidentally shown—"a rise of prices quickens the pace and a fall relaxes the energy"; and the influence of that *vis inertiae*, which retards the effect of changing prices upon wages. Chapter III. investigates the rise of prices consequent on the discovery of America. Prices in England rose from 200 to 300 per cent. in the century that followed. But the question is complicated by the debasement of the currency, which, whilst it tended of itself to increase prices, retarded the influx of the precious metals into England. Chapters IV., V., VI. trace the monetary record of the present century. Here statistics are much fuller, but this very fulness is often bewildering, and the complications of cause and effect are enormously greater. "The growth of industry and commerce, and the interruptions of that growth, the consumption of the metals in the arts, and the drain to the East, are facts of importance, and admit of rough approximate measurement. But the war with France is a factor in the movement of prices, which cannot be neglected; and the suspension of specie payments is an element of the situation, on the precise character and consequences of which an interminable dispute has raged" (p. 105). The difficulties, of course, become greater as the end of the present century is reached. Certain points, however, are clear—*e.g.*, the index numbers of different statisticians agree remarkably in proving a great fall of prices since 1873, and the dislocation of the ratio between silver and gold by the suspension of the free coinage of silver in the Latin states is an admitted fact. As to the effect of the disturbance of this ratio on trade between England and India, Mr. Price remarks:—

"It was inevitable that either silver prices should rise in India or gold prices fall in England. Some expectations were entertained that the adjustment would be effected by the former process; but there were *a priori* reasons for thinking this unlikely, and the evidence of actual experience has confirmed these reasons. Prices in an Oriental country, where custom is powerful, and the spirit of business enterprise inelastic, are rigid when compared with the rapid movement and constant stir of the industrial and commercial economy of Western Europe. If, therefore, a readjustment in relative prices becomes inevitable, it is more likely to be effected in the country, where the *vis inertiae* resisting change is weaker. . . .

[1] "Money and its Relations to Prices: being an Inquiry into the Causes, Measurement and Effects of Changes in General Prices." By L. L. PRICE, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.)

This *a priori* probability has been confirmed by actual experience. Until recently prices in India, which were silver prices, had not risen; and prices in England, which were gold prices, had fallen."

Mr. Price's general conclusion is that "it is impossible to doubt that the fall of prices shown by the index number is connected with monetary changes," and that this fall of prices has operated to some extent as a check to material prosperity. The whole book bears evidence of the most careful research and of the writer's earnest endeavour after strict impartiality.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

"INDIA MUST BE BLED."

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

We discuss elsewhere the proposal of the British Government to charge upon the Indian revenues the "ordinary" expenses of Indian troops despatched to the Sudan. The subject has attracted a good deal of attention—and, on the whole, remarkably friendly attention—in the British press. We give below a series of typical opinions which will doubtless be read with interest in India.

"A Grave Injustice."

The *Daily News* wrote on May 13th:—The questions put and the answers given in the House of Commons yesterday on the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan are a curious study. They show, in the first place, that there has been little or no communication between Cabinet Ministers on a very serious subject, and, in the second place, that Mr. Balfour will not listen to his colleagues when he is sitting on the same bench with them. Sir Charles Dilke asked the Secretary of State for India whether the necessary motion would be made in the House for authority to charge the expenses of this force upon the revenues of India. Lord George Hamilton replied in vague language, which was understood to mean that in his valuable opinion no such Parliamentary sanction would be required. Sir Charles Dilke reminded him that a directly opposite opinion had been expressed eleven years ago by the late Mr. Cross, then Under-Secretary for India, who moved and carried the resolution declared by Lord George to be superfluous. The circumstances were almost precisely similar, the destination of the troops being then, as now, the Sudan, and Lord Hartington had done the same thing in 1882. But Lord George Hamilton had forgotten all about it, and did not even know to what Sir Charles Dilke referred. Finding Lord George hopeless, the Opposition gave him up as a bad job, and tried the First Lord of the Treasury. Mr. Balfour took a view totally different from the view of Lord George Hamilton. He admitted at once that if there were any charge upon the revenues of India the House must give its assent and promised a day for the purpose. The compliance of the House, it may be observed, is equally essential whether the draft upon India's resources is refunded from the British Exchequer or not. There will thus be a full opportunity for discussing the policy of sending these troops, and the objects for which they are sent. Perhaps, before that time, the Cabinet will have met, and arrived at some understanding. But if the people of India are made to pay for this expedition, or for any part of it, a grave injustice will be inflicted upon them.

"An Outrage."

The *Daily Chronicle* (May 12th) wrote:—The news that Indian troops are to occupy Suakin looks very different from two different points of view. Since we are plunged into this expedition—this war, we may say—it is obviously desirable that it should be brought to a successful close as quickly, as efficiently, as cheaply as possible, and with the least sacrifice of life. Therefore, since Indian troops are much better fitted to act in the climate of the Red Sea than British troops, and since they can be ready for despatch in a week, and are not required elsewhere at the present time, it seems wise, from the mere military point of view, to employ them. But to place the extra expense of their co-operation upon India would be an outrage. We certainly understood that the Government had already stated that the cost of the Sudan war would be borne by Egypt. If not, then certainly the Imperial Government must pay for it. India is only concerned with Egypt as the Cape, the Australian colonies, and the Far Eastern colonies are concerned, and if India should pay, then Australia and Hong Kong should also bear a direct share. Which is absurd. The British Government has undertaken the war, and the British taxpayer will have to pay every bill that Egypt leaves unpaid.

"Sponging on the Indigent Taxpayers of India."

The *Manchester Guardian* (May 13th) wrote: The Government would do better to say at once whether it intends to sponge on the indigent taxpayers of India for part of the costs of the Sudan expedition. There was more beating about the bush at question time in the House of Commons yesterday. Indian troops, it is known, are to be used at Suakin. But when the Government is asked whether the Indian or the Imperial Exchequer is to defray the additional expense of their employment outside India, it replies that it really does not know. Perhaps the British taxpayer will pay, perhaps the Indian, perhaps the Egyptian. It is equally discreditable to the Government whether this ignorance of its own intentions is sincere or simulated. If it be sincere, then the Government really thinks it might be defensible to burden the Indian taxpayers with part of the cost of an expedition with which India has no more concern than Australia, and—if all that is rumoured be true—far less concern than the British colonies in Africa. To do this would be to adopt the infatuated Spanish policy of stimulating disaffection in weak colonial dependencies by extorting money from them in relief of home taxation. For if the Indian taxpayer does not pay, then the British taxpayer must do so. The money that Egypt has by her to be

spent on this adventure must already be almost gone, the prospective bill is growing larger every day, and it must be footed either by India or by the United Kingdom. The former alternative would be more profitable to the Government as the heads of a party. If they adopted it they could gratify with a serious but comparatively cheap war the diffused appetite for national excitement which is the curse of the country. But the offence committed against the poor and helpless peoples of India would be monstrous. By the elaborate system of "Home Charges" for the Indian army these peoples are now paying a part of the cost of the garrisons of Great Britain and Ireland. While the Imperial Government did not venture to ask the colonies for a contribution to the cost of building the Colonial Office, it made India pay the whole cost of the vastly more expensive India Office. Even these are not such reliefs from taxation as a citizen of this country who keeps up some ideal of a duty towards India can accept with complacency. But it would be much more humiliating if it were felt that the taxes on the food of millions of half-starved peasants in Madras were to be raised in order that this rich empire might make new conquests in the interior of Africa for nothing. It is only charitable to suppose that the Government has already made up its mind not to increase the ordinary Indian contribution to the maintenance of the troops now to be brought to Suakin. In that case the shilly-shallying of Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Balfour, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach during the last two days only indicates a desire to break slowly to taxpayers in the United Kingdom the news that the Budget forecast of expenditure was fallacious, and that a heavy bill for warfare in the Sudan will probably have to be paid by new taxation next April.

Ministerial Levity and Nescience.

The *Star* (May 14th) wrote:—The cross-examination of the Treasury Bench by Mr. Morley, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Labouchere upon the expenses of the Indian troops in the Sudan has, at any rate, served to show how lightly responsible Ministers regard a question which is of vital importance to our reputation, and therefore to our authority, in India. Lord George Hamilton's replies, in particular, have displayed an ignorance which in any other member of the House of Commons would have been remarkable. The question raised is really threefold: (*a*) Who is going to pay for the Indian troops sent to the Sudan; (*b*) if India is to bear a part of the charge, will the assent of Parliament be duly obtained; and (*c*) will a resolution be submitted to Parliament, even though no part of the charge is to be borne by India? As to (*a*), Lord George Hamilton stated categorically on Monday that the expense would be apportioned between the Government of India and our own Government. Mr. Balfour corrected him, and explained that the Government of Egypt would also contribute a part. As to (*c*), Lord George Hamilton stated, and reiterated the statement, that if India made no contribution, no resolution need be submitted. Mr. Balfour has since corrected him, and admitted, as he was bound to do, that the precedents are all the other way. As to (*b*), there is no possibility of doubt or misunderstanding. It is clearly laid down in the Act of 1858 that, except in cases of emergency, Indian troops cannot be employed beyond the frontiers of India, at the expense of the Indian revenues, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament. Unless we are to assume that Lord George Hamilton was wrong at every point, India will bear a part of the charge. Yet the consent of Parliament has not been obtained, and the subject would not have been brought forward at all but for the zeal of members of the Opposition. It is now certain that a resolution will be submitted, and will, of course, be approved by the Government's machine-made majority. But what in the world has India to do with the Sudan, and why in the world should her poverty-stricken taxpayers pay a penny, or an anna, of the cost? When Lord Salisbury was Secretary of State for India, he said that the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf. The House of Commons needs to be constantly watchful of Lord Salisbury, who, as Prime Minister, said the other day that the Sudan expedition was undertaken in the interests of Egypt, while his Government intends that it shall be carried on at the expense of India. Unfortunately, the precedents are on the side of fleecing India for military operations with which she has no concern. Here is a catalogue showing the various occasions on which the British Government has borrowed troops from India:—

1859-60	China Expedition.
1860 and 1861	New Zealand.
1867	Abyssinian Expedition.
1875	Perak Expedition.
1878	Strengthening Malta.
1878	The Afghan War.
1882	Egypt.
1885	Sudan Expedition.

The loan of troops would, to begin with, have been impossible if we had not imposed upon India an army far larger than she needs, and more costly than she can afford. But not only has our Government compelled the people of India to maintain an excessively large army: it has also compelled them to bear the expense of troops removed from India for British operations. In the Afghan War and in the Egyptian Expedition the British Government threw the whole expense upon India, save for a contribution of £5,000,000 in one case and £500,000 in the other. In the China Expedition and the reinforcement of Malta we actually had the grace to pay the expenses of the troops we had borrowed, but in all the other cases, though the troops were moved from India, and India was deprived of their services, India paid the "ordinary" expenses. There can be little doubt that, in the present instance, this indescribably shabby policy will be pursued. Yet we plume ourselves—or, rather, Mr. Balfour and his friends plume themselves—upon our "prestige," and chatter about our "moral influence" in India. What hypocrisy it must all seem, to be sure, to the educated Indian, especially as it is only the pinch of the cotton duties that produces any doubts or enquiries in this country as to whether we are really treating India fairly. We are glad to see that Mr.

John Morley has put his shoulder to this wheel. May we hope that he will sift the Indian question as he has sifted the Irish question?

The "Spectator" Approves.

The *Spectator* of May 16th, in an article upon "The Formidableness of England," wrote: It is not a fortnight since the decision was taken to garrison Suakin from India, and already the regiments, foot, cavalry, artillery, Intelligence Department, engineers, and, we doubt not, all materials for telegraphs, if not for a short railway, are on their road to the Red Sea. A fortnight's longer notice, and the division could have been made an army corps; a month's, and a fully equipped army would have been on board the transports. They are among the best troops in the world, too—English soldiers annealed by what is practically foreign service, and Sikhs who have fought successfully with Englishmen, and who regard a summons to fight in Egypt or Burmah or China as a summons to a rollicking adventure, during which they can gratify their thirst for fighting and save the whole of their regular pay. When it is remembered that the Continent does not perceive accurately the limits of our power of recruiting, and does perceive that there are scarcely any limits to our power of spending, it is hardly wonderful that it should watch the movements of a State thus armed with a certain sleeplessness of suspicion. The English could do such terrible things if they would, and they do grab so much. We are not writing this because we object in any way to the despatch of Indian troops to the Red Sea. It is perfectly fair, if we have a plan to carry out on the Nile, that our magnificent ally, whom we help whenever she is in difficulty, should help us in return. India pays for her Army, but she does no pay for our Fleet, and it is our Fleet and not her Army which saves her from the invasions which, if we lost the command of the sea, would in three years destroy at once her commercial prosperity and her immunity from internal disorder. She ought not to pay extra money for a project which is ours, but it is perfectly fair that she should pay the wages and expenses which she would pay if the troops were at home. Her garrison is not the feebler but the stronger for a spell of foreign work, which reveals and cures defects of equipment, which binds officers and men together as nothing else does, and which, above all, gives the fighting races, Sikhs, and Pathans, and Mahrattas, an outlet for their inborn military spirit. There is no education for soldiers like a well-managed expedition, more especially if they are men who enjoy it, and if they belong to races which tend to despondency and fat if they never have anything to do. We think it quite fine if Canadian or Australian regiments volunteer to help us, and not to mention that every native soldier is a volunteer, who enlists uncompelled even by "the stern conscription of hunger," among the Sikhs and Pathans at all events, a call for volunteers would be answered by entire regiments stepping to the front. They love the excitement of campaigning, which to them seems life. It is nonsense to talk of "mercenaries" in an empire a hundred years old. It is as much their interest while the empire lasts that it should succeed in war as it is ours, and provided there is no conscription, we see no more moral objection to calling on her Majesty's Indian than on her Majesty's British or Irish subjects to fight on her behalf.

The Constitutional Right of Parliament.

The *Manchester Guardian* said on May 15th:—At every new step taken in the Sudan enterprise one wonders whether the Government is really in two minds about it or whether it is out of policy that it speaks with two tongues. This week it has given a fresh exhibition of perplexity or of shuffling, whichever it is to be called. On Monday it was known that Indian troops were to be brought to Suakin, an intention carefully unannounced in the war programme of last March. The Government was at once asked who was to pay for them and when the usual authorising resolution would be submitted to the House. The answers were as ambiguous as Mr. Curzon's mutually contradictory statements of the objects of the expedition itself. As to the expenses of the Indian draft, Lord George Hamilton said that the apportionment of the cost between the Indian and Imperial Exchequers was still under consideration. Was it to be understood, then, somebody asked, that the expense of these troops was not to be borne by the Egyptian Government? "No," Sir Michael Hicks-Beach replied at once; "not at all." So that according to Lord George Hamilton the expense is to be divided between India and the United Kingdom, and according to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach it is not to be understood that the expense will not be borne by Egypt. Within the same five minutes in which these two explanations were offered, Mr. Balfour offered a third—that the expense would be divided between all the three Governments. One might suppose that the subject of Egypt was tabooed at Cabinet Councils, and that Ministers trusted to their ingenuity to knock up some sort of Egyptian policy between them after coming down to the House. There is the same haziness, to say the least of it, in their answers to questions about the authorising resolution. One member of the Cabinet, it is known, has published very strong views on the question. This is the Duke of Devonshire. But his colleagues contradict him and each other without hesitation. On Monday Sir Michael Hicks-Beach practically told the House that the Act of Parliament required a resolution authorising the use of the Indian troops to be submitted to the House if the ordinary expenses of those troops when serving outside India were to be charged to the Indian Government. On Tuesday Mr. Balfour said that,

> "in point of actual law there was no obligation to have the consent of Parliament unless some extra charge was thrown upon Indian finance."

Now what is to be gathered from all these authoritative explanations? First, that when India only bears the ordinary expense of the use of Indian troops outside India, the authority of Parliament is required for their use. Secondly, that it is not required. Thirdly, that the expense of their employment in this instance is to be divided between the

United Kingdom and India. Fourthly, that it is not to be supposed that this expense will not be borne by Egypt. Fifthly, that this expense will be divided between all three.

Lord George Hamilton is to make a further statement to-night, and Mr. Balfour, adhering to his new practice of arranging one part of the Session's work so as to bribe the House to scamp another, promised that the first Parliamentary day after the Agricultural Rating Bill had passed the Committee stage should be given up to a discussion of the subject. By assuming this air of concession Mr. Balfour puts the subject in a false light. It is not a case in which the Opposition should be left to invite or force a discussion. If the Government did not throw all precedent aside, Lord George Hamilton would give notice to-day of a motion relating to the employment of the Indian troops, and it would be discussed without a day's unnecessary delay. The chief case in point occurred on July 31st, 1882. Then, as now, it had been determined to use Indian troops for Egyptian service. It was not yet determined, just as it is apparently not yet determined by the present Cabinet, in what proportions the Imperial and the Indian Exchequer should contribute to the expenses of their employment. Nevertheless, the Duke of Devonshire, then, of course, Lord Hartington, proposed a resolution giving the consent of the House to the charging of the Indian revenues with some undefined contribution to the expenses. The opening sentences of the Duke of Devonshire's speech are worth remembering:

"The purpose," he said, "with which the resolution is moved is not mainly, nor yet all, of a financial character, but is rather of a political and a constitutional character. The necessity of moving this resolution is defined in the 55th section of the Act for the Government of India. That section has been the subject from time to time of a good deal of controversy. But for this section it would be possible—I do not say it would be probable, but it was conceivable—that the Government might carry on military operations through the agency of the Government of India, by means of the troops maintained on the Indian establishment and charged on the Indian revenues, without the consent of Parliament at all. I do not say that such a case is probable, but it is not only to prevent such a contingency that the section was framed. It also reserves to Parliament the power of deciding on the question whether, in case of an operation or a policy which has been essentially and in principle decided on by Parliament, whether such a policy may be carried out by the agency of Indian troops, or only by the agency of troops on the British establishment."

The Duke of Devonshire's declaration is in letter, and still more in spirit, absolutely opposed to Mr. Balfour's. Mr. Balfour treats the resort to Parliament for an authorising resolution as a matter of merely formal consequence. The Duke of Devonshire enters thoroughly into the meaning of the regulating Act, and shows that it was intended not merely to control the apportionment of certain military expenditure, but to give Parliament the power of deciding in what circumstances Indian troops might properly be employed outside India. The policy of the present Government is, first, to employ Indian troops at its own discretion for military operations in which India has no interest, or at most an interest so extremely remote as to be not worth mentioning. It then refuses to make any definite statement of the proposed financial arrangements, and tells the House of Commons that this piece of neglect on the part of the Government deprives Parliament of its constitutional right to judge of the propriety of the use to which Indian troops are being put. Finally, Mr. Balfour says in a casual fashion that the House will be allowed to discuss the matter. He is so good as to say that, since it seems to be the custom, the Government will not contravene the Act for the Government of India. Still it is to be understood that the requirements of that Act cannot be satisfied until a party measure for the benefit of one class of the Government's supporters has been forced through Committee.

There are two points upon which independent members of the House must insist. First, there is the point emphasised by the Duke of Devonshire in 1882. It is the right and duty of Parliament to control the employment of Indian troops outside India—not merely to say how the expenses of such employment shall be defrayed, but on what occasions it shall be permitted. For many years our Governments have been sliding into a practice of treating the employment of the Indian army for foreign service as a matter in which Parliament has no voice or merely a formal voice. That was not the intention of the Act and the intentions of the Act must be made plain. In the second place there must be at least a vigorous protest against any inclination on the Government's part to sponge on the Indian taxes for the relief of taxpayers at home. In this adventure in the Sudan, India has practically no interest whatever. It may be said that India is a part of the Empire and that every limb has an interest in the body. But then Canada has an equal interest, and so has New Zealand, and the Cape Colony has in this case an interest less remote. Yet the Government would never dream of making Canada or Australia or the South African colonies contribute to the cost. India is brought into the matter simply and solely because she contains a standing army that can be used, and because from the form of her Government that army is practically at the disposal of the Cabinet. But the Indian army is there for the good of India. It is maintained to protect her from foreign invasion and from internal disorder. That is the only theory which justifies the imposition of its whole cost on the country itself—it keeps India safe, and therefore India must pay for it. But now, in order that England may prosecute "the reclamation of the Sudan from barbarism" and other apostolic schemes with which India has no concern, India is for a time to be deprived of a portion of that force which Anglo-Indian experts constantly declare to be the very minimum necessary for her safety. Reason and fairness suggest that for such a sacrifice she should be paid, not that she should herself pay for having to make it. Perfect equity lays it down that since India, according to the accepted theory, only pays for her army because it gives her protection, she should not pay for it, or for a part of it, during any period for which the protection offered by its presence is withdrawn. While any portion of the Indian army is employed in the Sudan enterprise, the relation towards India which alone justifies the charging of India with its

cost is suspended so far as this portion is concerned. It becomes to all intents and purposes a portion of the ordinary British army, employed on non-Indian service, and not justly chargeable on the Indian taxes. Justice would only be perfectly satisfied if, in the first place, India were relieved for the time of a charge for which during that time she receives no return; and if, in the second place, she received some equivalent for the temporary impairing of her security. This last equivalent, we fear, she need not hope for, and there is only too little chance that in this instance she will be relieved of the "ordinary" charges for the troops absent in Africa. While they are garrisoning Suakin, or advancing from it into the desert, India will probably contribute to their maintenance at least as much as if they were patrolling the north-west frontier of India or keeping down dacoity in Burma. That is how India has been regularly treated in the past, but there is no reason why a strong protest should not be made against an arrangement clearly inequitable, no matter how many precedents there may be for it. Still more necessary is it that injustice should not go further, as it has often done before, and that the Indian taxpayers should not be actually burdened with any part of the excessive cost of the employment of Indian troops in African warfare, over and above the sum which they would have cost if they had remained in the ordinary service of India. It is bad enough that India should be deprived, perhaps for a long time, of a part of her normal protection; worse still that she should continue to pay for it at the same rate while it is withheld from her; worst of all that she should pay even more for having it withheld than for enjoying the benefit of it.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

RELIEF FOR THE RICH: BURDENS FOR THE POOR.

LORD G. HAMILTON AND THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

Under the heading, "The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor," the following correspondence between the Indian Parliamentary Committee and the Secretary of State for India was circulated on May 7th to members of Parliament, the Press and others, "for the purpose of bringing to their notice the strong objections taken by Indian public opinion to the recent rearrangement of the cotton duties."

"It is contended," wrote Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. J. Herbert Roberts in the paragraph introducing the correspondence, "that the effect of this rearrangement, unless disallowed by the Secretary of State, will be to lighten considerably the taxation falling on the richer classes in India, while adding to the taxation upon the poorest classes, who already bear an excessive share of the public burdens."

To the Right Honourable

Lord George Francis Hamilton, M.P.,
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India,
India Office, Whitehall, S.W.

My Lord,—At the request of the Indian Parliamentary Committee I have the honour to submit to you certain considerations in favour of modifying in one particular the re-arrangement of the cotton duties recently adopted by the Indian Government.

2. The modification is simply this: that the Government of India should be directed to exempt, by Executive orders, from all duty, whether excise or import, all cloths, whether Indian made or imported, into whose composition no yarns of a higher count than 20s enter.

3. The main grounds of this recommendation are four:

(1) That the suggested remission of tax upon the coarser cloth will give relief to the extent of 10½ lakhs to the poorest classes, already depressed by a 4,000 per cent. duty on the salt they consume (viz., 2 rs. 8 annas per maund on what costs only 1 anna to produce); and that it will give universal satisfaction throughout India, thereby affording great moral support to our administration.

(2) That the recent imposition of 10½ lakhs of taxation upon the coarser cloth is especially open to objection on the present occasion because the rest of the re-arrangement involved the remission of 37 lakhs (or, if the duty on fine yarns be added, 51 lakhs) of taxation, hitherto paid by the less needy classes.

(3) That the sole original ground for imposing excise duty was to prevent the import duty operating protectively. But the 3½ per cent. excise recently imposed on the coarser cloth operates protectively in a high degree, inasmuch as Bombay and Manchester together supply at most two-fifths of the Indian consumption of such cloth, while three-fifths are produced by mills in Native States and by hand looms throughout India; thus two-fifths will be taxed and three-fifths escape taxation.

Incidentally it may be noted that this excise duty will distinctly encourage British subjects to start new mills in Native States, and so deprive the population of British India of employment which they would have otherwise obtained from the further development of this industry.

(4) That in many parts of India definite attempts are being made to organise a boycott of English cloth. As the ground of preaching this boycott is an alleged injustice to India by the Government in favour of Lancashire, such a movement is undesirable, if not actually dangerous, from a political point of view.

4. So far as the Committee are aware only three objections can be raised to the modification recommended.

(1) That it will involve some loss of revenue. It is true that it will involve a loss of possibly 18½ lakhs of *estimated* revenue, but of this 10½ lakhs will be *new* taxation on the poorest classes imposed by this re-arrangement.

(2) That it is impossible, if any line be drawn by counts, to deal equitably with all cloths. It may be at once conceded that if it were intended to tax cloths proportionally to the amount of higher count yarns that they contain, it would, as has long ago been discovered, be enormously difficult. But it is only proposed that cloths containing no higher counts than 20s should be exempt, all others,

whether they contain one-tenth or nine-tenths of higher count yarns, remaining liable to taxation, and this rule can be carried out in practice without any serious difficulty. If, however, it be argued that it is unjust that cloth which contains only a small proportion of higher count yarns should pay as much as one entirely composed of these, the answer simply is, that the rule being publicly laid down, it is the manufacturer's own fault if, by using any higher count in his web, he renders it dutiable.

(3) That the exemption of coarser goods may lead to their substitution in consumption for our finer qualities of cloth. No one who knows India, however, will endorse this purely hypothetical objection. Even in England such a substitution would not be easily effected; and in India, where custom has so strong a hold upon the people, a change of this kind would be practically impossible.

5. Trusting that you will give favourable consideration to the points above set forth,

I have the honour to be, my Lord,
Your obedient servant,
W. WEDDERBURN,
Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

21*st April*, 1896.

India Office, *5th May*, 1896.

Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.

Sir,—I am directed by Lord George Hamilton to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 29th April, 1896, in which you show cause against the recent readjustment of the Indian cotton duties, and you recommend that the Government of India should be directed to exempt from import or excise duty all cotton cloths containing no yarns of higher counts than 20s.

The recent revision of the cotton duties was undertaken in order to redeem the pledges given by the late and present Government that those duties should not be retained in a shape that gave a fiscal advantage to goods made at Indian mills as compared with similar goods imported from the United Kingdom. In the Parliamentary return which will shortly be ready for distribution will be found detailed statements regarding the protective character of the duties imposed in December, 1894; and it was practically admitted that, though there were differences of opinion as to the extent of the protection conferred on Indian-made goods by the legislation of 1894, there was an element of protection in the legislation recently imposed.

The legislation of 1894 had imposed a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on all imported yarns and woven goods, and also an excise duty on all yarns of counts above 20s made at Indian mills. The experience of 1879-80 had shown that an artificial line drawn for fiscal purposes between certain classes of woven goods operated injuriously both on the trade and on the revenue. The bulk of the produce of Indian mills (see page 8 of Parliamentary Paper, No. 7602 of 1895)—more than 80 per cent.—consists of yarns, and less than 20 per cent. consists of woven goods; while at the same time there were signs of an increase in the importation of British yarns. Any duties that were imposed or retained would in the end fall upon the consumer; and it was considered the best way of relieving the trade (Indian as well as foreign) from artificial restrictions, of diminishing the burdens on the consumer, and of excluding all semblance of protection, would be to make all yarns altogether free of duty, and to place a duty on all woven goods. At the same time it was decided to reduce the rate of cotton duties from 5 per cent. to 3½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

It is difficult to see how, if any cotton duties yielding about Rx. 1,000,000 a year were necessary, there could have been fuller simplification of the tariff, or how all protective element could have been more completely eliminated. It is certainly the case that goods made at Indian mills will now bear a larger proportionate share of the duties than they did under the legislation of 1894; but it is acknowledged that under the earlier Act such goods were more or less protected, and the later legislation was undertaken mainly to eliminate all such protective element.

In regard to the special objections you urge against the recent arrangement, I am to say that, so far as Lord George Hamilton is aware, there is no ground for believing that cotton goods woven from yarns of 20s and under are used exclusively, or nearly exclusively, by the poorest classes, though it is undoubtedly the case that in India, as in many other countries, the majority of the population are poor. Lord George Hamilton does not share the expectation that the 3½ per cent. duty on mill-woven goods will enable hand-looms to compete successfully with power mills, or to reduce the demand for mill-made cloth.

The possible competition of mills in Native States cannot at present be a serious factor in the problem. According to the latest returns—"Indian Commercial Statistics," vol. of 1896, pp. 374-379—there were in the Native States, Berar, and the French Settlements of India, 9 cotton mills, containing 1,613 looms, as compared with 127 mills containing 27,749 looms in British India. If hereafter competition from Mills in Native States should become serious, the law (Act II of 1896, section 37) gives the Government power to levy duties on such goods as may enter British India from Native States.

For these conclusive reasons Lord George Hamilton cannot disturb the equitable arrangement recently arrived at in connection with these duties.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
G. W. E. LODER.

THE MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD.

The following record of the motion for adjournment appears in the "Votes and Proceedings" of the House of Commons for May 18th:—

68. Adjournment.—Sir William Wedderburn, member for Banffshire, rose in his place and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the effect of the Indian

cotton duties as recently rearranged, which increase the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of Indian consumers"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than 40 members having accordingly risen,

Motion made and question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn" (Sir William Wedderburn).

After debate thereon, Mr. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the question be now put"; but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, because it appeared to him that the House was prepared shortly to come to a decision without that motion. Debate resumed; motion, by leave, withdrawn.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "DAILY NEWS."

The *Daily News* wrote (May 19th): There is something to be said for Sir Henry Fowler's complaint that a motion for the adjournment of the House of Commons, such as Sir William Wedderburn made yesterday afternoon, is not the best way of discussing such a difficult and complicated subject as the Indian cotton duties. But that the Secretary of State for India should protest against it is really too absurd. For no one took a more prominent part than Lord George Hamilton in a similar debate raised in precisely the same manner at the beginning of last year. Sir William Wedderburn's case is simple enough. He argues that the duties as revised by the present Government take forty lakhs of rupees off the finer cloths which are used by the rich, and put ten lakhs on the coarses cloths which are worn by the poor. Lord George Hamilton says that the finer cloths are worn by the poor and the coarser cloths by the rich, which seems odd. Before Sir Henry Fowler left office he gave a pledge that if the duties were shown to be in any way protective he would modify them, so as to remove the element of protection. Lord George Hamilton, however, has completely changed the nature and incidence of the tax. In hope of conciliating Lancashire, which, so far as Mr. George Whiteley is concerned, has not been conciliated, he sacrificed a large amount of Indian revenue, and balanced this injury by exempting the products of the native hand looms. The objection to this policy is twofold. It cannot be reconciled either with the interests of India or with the doctrines of free trade. There has been considerable agitation in India against the new duties, though Lord George declares that it has not died out. Lancashire, in spite of Mr. Whiteley, has been more silent, probably hoping that the duties will be repealed next year. The subject will be more fully discussed on the Indian Budget, if there is anyone left to discuss it when the Indian Budget comes on.

THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

The *Manchester Guardian* wrote:—One good result of the discussion on the Indian import and excise duties on cotton goods raised in the House of Commons yesterday by Sir William Wedderburn is the promise that an early opportunity will be given for a full consideration of the Indian Budget. It may also be hoped that the reopening of the question will tend to stimulate the interest of the House in Indian affairs, and put an end to the indifference to questions affecting the government and the finances of our great dependency which in former years has been nothing less than a scandal. For the rest, the case presented by Sir William Wedderburn is quite out of date, and really never had in it anything worth serious consideration. He appears to be under the impression that the excise duty of 3½ per cent. imposed on coarse cloths produced in the Bombay and other mills in India, as the equivalent of a similar duty on all imported cloths, is specially felt as a hardship by the poorer classes in India, and that this assumption is proved to be a fact by the threat to "boycott" Lancashire goods, of which something was heard some time ago. Of course Lancashire would be very glad to see both Indian excise and import duties on cotton cloths abolished; they are alike objectionable from every point of view, and it is to be hoped that the promised discussion on the Indian Budget will demonstrate not only that they are mischievous, but that they are unnecessary. But to those who are familiar with all the facts of the case it seems difficult to believe that Sir William Wedderburn was even serious in the arguments which he put forward. If there is one thing more certain than another it is that the whole "boycotting" agitation—of which nothing has been heard for several mails past—was the mere threat of a number of interested mill managers, agents, and shareholders, who naturally desire to escape, if possible, the payment of a tax of 3½ per cent. on anything. The discussion had, however, in addition to drawing attention to the duty of the House with regard to the Indian Budget, the good effect of enabling the Secretary of State for India to expose, once for all, the fallacy that imported Lancashire goods are consumed only by the well-to-do classes. In connection with the attempts made in various quarters to justify protection for the Bombay mills, there has been more nonsense uttered on this point than on any other. The existing system of duties is not everything that could be desired, but, in view of all the circumstances, it is probably the best compromise that could be arrived at, short of the entire abolition of what must in any case be vexatious imposts.

THE "TIMES."

The *Times* said:—Sir William Wedderburn thought it opportune and advantageous to move the adjournment of the House, after question time, in order to call attention to the alleged dissatisfaction in India caused by the recent rearrangement of the cotton duties. The motion was supported by almost the whole of the Opposition, except the occupants of the front bench, and a couple of hours were spent in a purposeless and mischievous debate. Lord George Hamilton's defence of his action against the censures of Sir William Wedderburn and of Sir John Leng appears to be complete. He demonstrated conclusively that the adoption of the plan of exempting

from both excise and import duties all the coarser counts of manufactured cottons would knock away the keystone from the policy that has just been tried. But the strongest objection to raising the question in the way in which Sir William Wedderburn raised it were urged by Sir Henry Fowler. The late Secretary for India said that he was willing to defend his own conduct, and, when necessary, to criticise his successor's measures, at the proper time. But it was not right, he contended, to spring such a motion on the House, practically without notice, when members had not had time to read the Blue-book that had just appeared. The intervention attempted was not only premature and inconclusive, but calculated to create a dangerous disturbance of feeling in India, without any possibility of benefit to our Indian fellow-subjects. Sir Henry Fowler's refusal to allow Indian affairs to be dragged into the vortex of party politics is greatly to his credit, and is an example which both sides ought to keep before them.

The writer of the Parliamentary sketch in the *Daily Chronicle* said: To fulfil their pledges to Lancashire the Government have put a tax on the cottons made in India—the coarse cottons used by the poorest of the people; and Sir William Wedderburn—the best friend India has in the House—voiced the Indian native protest against this action. The subject is possibly complicated to English ears, and Sir Willian Wedderburn sprang it suddenly on the House, with the result of a very poor and inadequate debate. Sir Henry Fowler showed an almost excessive annoyance at Sir William's precipitancy, finally persuading him to withdraw his motion without a division. Lord George Hamilton seized the opportunity to prove that he had fulfilled his promise to the people of Lancashire. The debate was undoubtedly somewhat premature, and should have been planned more carefully; but the development of the business will require to be keenly watched by the Opposition. It looks as if the Governments of England and India were striking a bargain which will satisfy both themselves and the Manchester merchants, while it places yet another tax of a hateful and oppressive kind on the people of India. The countervailing duty on the Indian cheap cottons is to compensate the Manchester merchant for the custom duty on his imported cottons.

The *Liverpool Daily Post* (May 8th) wrote: From the correspondence that has passed between Sir W. Wedderburn and Lord George Hamilton, it is evident that the Government's tinkering with the Indian Cotton Duties, in order to redeem electioneering pledges, has not produced satisfactory results in India. Sir H. Fowler did his best to establish absolutely equal treatment between the Indian and the Lancashire cotton trade, but Lord George Hamilton thought he could do better. There was, he says, an element of Protection in Sir H. Fowler's scheme of Customs and Excise Duties, and he wished to eliminate this objectionable feature. We have no liking for Protection in any form, not even by paying rates for people who are quite capable of paying them themselves, and if there was really a Protective element in Sir H. Fowler's Indian Cotton Duties it was very desirable that it should be removed. But it should not be removed by creating a greater evil, and this, unfortunately, is what Lord George Hamilton has done. And he has not only created a greater evil, but he has not eliminated the Protective element. His new duty still leaves the produce of native hand looms untaxed, and of the coarse cloths that are in question three-fifths are the produce of these looms. But this is not the real evil of the new duty. The serious and lamentable feature of the change that Lord George Hamilton has made is that he has taken 51 lakhs of taxation off the more comfortable classes in India, and has put $10\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of new taxation on the very poor. The finances of India are fortunately in a better condition than when Sir H. Fowler was compelled to sanction the cotton duties, and it would have been gratifying on all sides if Lord George Hamilton could have reduced, still better if he could have abolished them. He has reduced them, but for every £1 he has taken off the richer classes he has put a new tax of 4s. on the poor, who already pay a tax of 40 per cent. on salt, which in India is an indispensable article of consumption. This is the evil which Sir W. Wedderburn wishes to have removed, but Lord George Hamilton is so inflexible a Free Trader that he prefers to relieve the rich at the cost of the poor, rather than leave open to Protection a chink so small that it could scarcely squeeze in a little finger.

Reviews.

THE SPOILS OF WAR.

Indian and Oriental Armour. By the Right Hon. Lord Egerton of Tatton, M.A., etc. New edition, enlarged. (London: W. H. Allen and Co.)

Even to the uninitiated the diversity of form and decoration exhibited by the weapons, offensive and defensive, collected from India at various times, brings home the essential complexity of the nations grouped together for convenient reference under the term Indian people. The Indian peninsula has been the scene of some of the most tremendous and stirring conflicts in the world's history. From early times its wealth was proverbial, exaggerated no doubt by its distance from western civilisation and the difficulties of access. But no consideration of the obstacles in their path prevented the warlike races of the west from endeavouring to secure for themselves some portion of this untold wealth, and a series of invasions took place, the earliest of which is assigned by a not altogether incredible tradition to two thousand years before the Christian era. This and yet another legendary invasion proceeded from Egypt. When the Persian Empire had succeeded the decline of the power of Egypt, the new rulers of Western Asia conquered and made tributary the provinces on the Indus. But the Persian power, in its turn, broke on the barriers of Hellenic civilisation, and made room for the great Macedonian conqueror, who in the fourth century overran the peninsula, and established relations between the eastern and western world, which provided stores of information about lands hitherto peopled by the shadowy figments of popular fancy. The cautious Romans, in spite of Horace's glowing prophecies, held their hands from a country which their common sense taught them was beyond even the long reach of an emperor governing at Rome; but the Scythians seem to have kept up the tradition of invasion and conquest, allowing the northern parts of India little rest before the Muhammadan invasion began. After a couple of inroads, one at the beginning of the eighth, the other at the end of the tenth century, the Muhammadans devoted themselves to a regular conquest which occupied three centuries. Then the Tartars raided Northern India, but found a permanent settlement inadvisable. How European influence established itself on the coast, and how, when the Mughal empire was breaking up, the English traders, by skilfully availing themselves of the divisions between the inhabitants of the peninsula, secured their own supremacy, we all know. It is treated in the chapter of our histories veraciously entitled the "Conquest of India." The spoils of this "conquest" have furnished, in the main, the

materials for the various collections of oriental arms and armour described and discussed by Lord Egerton. Traces of the arms of the earlier semi-mythical period are stated to exist in sufficient numbers to repay an investigator, but they are scattered about the world. In the arms of the historic period, however, England is, naturally, exceptionally rich. The only other really good collection is possessed by the Emperor of Russia, who has wisely had his possessions carefully catalogued, illustrated, and described. With our characteristic indifference in matters of art and antiquities we have left this important work to private enterprise. The authorities have never even taken any steps whatever towards amalgamating the treasures divided between the India Museum and the Tower; but lately, impressed with the fact that the collections in the Tower and the India Museum supplemented each other's deficiencies, by their respective duplicates, in a remarkable manner, they arranged for the removal of the latter collection to South Kensington, and so banished the temptation to act reasonably and piece out both into connected series. Fortunately for historians and antiquarians Lord Egerton, though his protests were unable to prevent the piece of official stupidity just mentioned, had the public spirit to draw up for general reference a descriptive catalogue of the Indian Museum collection, illustrated by numerous plates, and preceded by a sketch in outline of the history of Indian warfare, containing information enough to enable the general reader to grasp the historic importance of the objects described; while a later chapter of the work calls attention to their artistic value. Not content with his first attempt to remedy official neglect, he has been at considerable pains to make the alterations in his work necessitated by the transfer already alluded to, to enlarge and in part rewrite the text, and to add an illustrated catalogue of his own remarkable collection of Oriental arms. To an Englishman anything about India ought to be interesting. *Anglus sum, nil Indianum a me alienum puto*, ought to be a suitable motto for every Briton who can even faintly grasp the overwhelming and daily increasing importance of Indian questions in their bearing on Imperial matters. To the historian and amateur the work of Lord Egerton appeals in a special degree. To the latter because the artistic importance of many of the weapons is evident to the merest tyro. To the former not merely for the intrinsic interest they possess as recalling the stirring contests of bygone ages, but also because arms and their decoration have an ethnographic bearing so notable as in some cases even to outweigh the evidences afforded by philology where questions of tribal origin and distribution are in dispute.

An experience of more than forty years as a collector of Eastern, and especially of Indian, implements of war, and of every kind of information relating thereto, has provided the noble author with a unique equipment for the task he set himself to perform, and is sufficient guarantee for the accuracy of his work, even without the careful revision it has received at the hands of other well-known authorities in Indian lore. It is, therefore, the more to be regretted that the book has hardly received fair treatment at the hands of the printer. The woodcuts are creditably drawn, but not so creditably printed; the full-page lithographic plates are uneven in quality, perhaps because the paper appears to vary in quality; the two coloured plates contrast not very favourably with such work as Messrs. Macmillan turned out in the illustrated edition of Green's short history a few years ago; the photographic plates of Lord Egerton's own collection are the best in the book. The paper upon which the book is printed is none of the best, in many places the woodcuts have printed through, and, moreover, it is not even of a uniform degree of mediocrity. If the naturally limited circulation of such a work prevents its publication in a really satisfactory form without involving its author in considerable pecuniary loss as the reward of his useful labour, might not the South Kensington authorities recognise the performance of a duty neglected by themselves, and subsidise the volume?

THE THEOSOPHY OF THE VEDAS.

The Upanishads: translated into English, with a Preamble and Arguments. By G. R. S. Mead, B.A., M.R.A.S., and Jagadisha Chandra Chattopadhyaya (Roy Choudhuri). Vol. I. (London: Theosophical Publishing Society. Benares: The Theosophical Publishing Society. Madras: Theosophical Society, Adyar.)

This instalment of a fresh translation of the Upanishads includes "Ishopanishad, Kenopanishad, Kathopanishad, Prashnopanishad, Mundakopanishad, and Mândûkyopanishad." The object of the translators is "to place the sublime teachings of the Upanishads within the reach of every man and woman who can read the English tongue." That object is unimpeachably good; but, as there seems to be no mention of previous English translations, it may be recalled to the memory of the translators that Professor Max Müller devoted two volumes of the series of "Sacred Books of the East" to the Upanishads, one of these volumes leading off the series. The translation is very difficult work, and it is not surprising to find here occasional deviations from the rendering given by Professor Max Müller of such Upanishads as are common to both. The stricter adherence to literal equivalence in the present issue, and the more sparing use of explanatory additions, whatever their advantage in other respects, certainly increase the ordinary reader's difficulties in understanding the sense. "The Upanishads," say the present translators, "should be allowed to speak for themselves, and not be left to the mercy of artificial commentators." Everything depends upon the quality of the commentator; and it is hardly possible but that the incidental suggestions of a competent scholar should be more useful to the English neophyte than the uninstructed exercise of his own intelligence. Without skilled direction, indeed, it is a puzzle to say what foreign notions he may read into the vagueness of the texts. The Upanishads, we are told, "are grand outpourings of religious enthusiasm, raising the mind out of the chaos of ceremony and the metaphysical and philological word-spinning of the schools." The indefinite

sneer might have been spared, and the laudation might justly have been qualified. Such qualification was the very first task that Professor Max Müller addressed himself to in his preface to the "Sacred Books of the East." "We must face the problem in its completeness," he wrote, "and I confess it has been for many years a problem to me, aye, and to a great extent is so still, how the Sacred Books of the East should, by the side of so much that is fresh, natural, simple, beautiful, and true, contain so much that is not only unmeaning, artificial, and silly, but even hideous and repellent." This general acknowledgment is to a certain extent applicable to the Upanishads, and it is in the interests of scientific criticism that some account should be taken of it. Though the general run of students will hardly join in the ecstacies of the new translators, or even in the more balanced laudations of Schopenhauer, still the Upanishads must be always regarded as remarkable and important expressions of human thought. The popularisation of them in sixpennyworths is a very good idea, therefore, especially if the editors would extend their comment, and direct their effervescing enthusiasm into more definite and practically useful channels than childish literalness and slavish adherence to the order of words in the original. These things merely serve to perplex, and to invest the text with an irrelevant curiousness.

THE HINDU AT HOME.

The Hindu at Home, being Sketches of Hindu Daily Life. By the Rev. J. E. PADFIELD, B.D., Missionary, C. M. S., Masulipatam. (Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Madras.)

There is here gathered together a series of sketches which have appeared from time to time since 1885 in the pages of the *Madras Christian College Magazine.* They deal with the manners and customs of the Hindus, and especially with the orthodox section of the community who follow the rules of the Brahmanical religion. The position of missionaries does, no doubt, offer facilities to those who wish to use them of studying closely the daily lives of the people among whom they work, and Mr. Padfield appears to have used his opportunities well. As he most truly says:—

"Speaking as a missionary, it is impossible to be thoroughly 'in touch' with a people of whose social and religious habits and customs one may know but little or nothing. A knowledge of the daily life of the people aids in arriving at more or less correct conclusions as to their modes of thought and motives for action; and it is only with the aid of such knowledge that one can reasonably hope to attain much result in influencing them in such a deeply personal matter as religion."

Of course most of what he relates will be familiar to anyone who has visited India, and taken any interest in the native population, or has read one of the many books of this kind already published. But there is no new thing under the sun, and we have no doubt that the information here given is as correct and in as readable a form as in other books of greater pretensions. It is no uncommon thing for a missionary to write a book. Unfortunately, it is also not uncommon for the book to be the most unfavourable commentary on the intercourse between missionary and people. Mr. Padfield does not adopt the condescending tone. The way in which every act of a Hindu's life is regulated by his religion is obvious to every observer. From the moment of his birth to his death, there is scarcely an act too trivial to be hedged about with rite and ceremony. He is washed, clothed, and shaved in accordance with traditional observance. By the way, we suppose it is the missionary spirit which leads the author to terminate a chapter on the inconvenient formalities with regard to shaving by a reflection on the "glorious liberty" of the Christian. In such a connexion it savours somewhat of the ludicrous. There is a very clear and discriminating account of mendicity in India. There is no doubt that, however excellently the charity of the people may reflect upon the givers, one effect of so much unreflecting almsgiving is the existence of a large indolent class who pass their time without doing one stroke of useful work and are never made to feel either the distress of want or the degradation of their position. It is strange to notice how similar (if we allow for exaggeration of language) are the exhortations to charity to Brahman and Christian and how differently they are interpreted. But there is no doubt a more excellent way. The ceremonies of marriage and burial fill several chapters. These are the most striking and the most familiar of all. The observances vary a little from place to place. They are elaborate, lengthy, and expensive.

"There is no greater cause of financial misery in Hindu families than expenses at marriages and funerals. In the case of wealthy men the burden is a great one; but in ordinary cases the funds have to be obtained from the money-lender at an exorbitant rate of interest, loading the poor victims with a lifelong burden of debt. The amelioration of matters of this kind amongst such a people can only be effected by a gradual growth of public opinion in the right direction, and any change of opinion, sufficient to be felt, must occupy a very long time in its formation."

The Hindus, perhaps more than other nations, are superstitious, and everything is an omen for good or ill. The brief facts that Mr. Padfield gives are full of interest and suggestion to those who are acquainted with the superstitions of other countries. For instance, the tingling of the right side of the body is auspicious, of the left side unfavourable; if a cat cross a traveller's path, his journey will be unlucky; and many besides these suggest parallels. Throughout the book the greatest care has been taken to quote the authorities for statements with regard to Hindu customs, in English and often with

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder

IS

"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

the Sanskrit equivalent, thus rendering the book additionally valuable, not simply to the English scholar, but to the Hindu himself.

A HINDUSTANI GRAMMAR.

A Practical Hindustani Grammar. By Lieutenant-Colonel A. O. Green, R.E. In 2 parts. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press.)

Colonel Green deserves the thanks of Englishmen who take up their residence in India, either in the capacity of officials, or as members of the increasing and by no means insignificant class who are occupied in industrial and commercial pursuits. The official who is bound to pass his departmental examination will find this "practical" Hindustani Grammar to be of great value. To the non-official, who is under no obligation to make a special study of the language and seldom has recourse to a *Munshi*, it will be of still greater value. With ordinary patience he will easily master the exercises, while Part II will remove any difficulties that may come in his way. Colonel Green would perhaps have done well to add a vocabulary to Part I which would not require more than half the space that is taken up by the "Selected Manuscripts" printed at the end of the book. The ordinary student who desires merely to obtain a colloquial knowledge of Hindustani, or to be able to read printed or lithographed books, will never probably be called upon to read a manuscript. The official who, in the course of his duties, is required to read manuscripts cannot familiarise himself too early with such documents. But the Hindustani manuscript is in the nature of a "short-hand," and it is impossible for any one to read it without the aid of an instructor specially conversant with writings of that kind. When an official takes up his duties, the papers that come before him probably afford him the best opportunity of learning to read the freehand, and his reader, or Shereshtedar, is his most convenient instructor. There is one defect to which Hindustani manuals written by Europeans are usually subject, and from which Colonel Green's compilation cannot claim to be free. Social intercourse between Europeans and Indians is, for many reasons, restricted, but there is one obstacle which it is possible to remove. Repectable Indians often complain that Europeans, in conversation with them, use language that Indians use only towards menials. In English, for example, the personal pronoun "you" is employed indiscriminately without regard to the position of the person addressed. It is not so in Hindustani, which requires the use of the pronoun *ap* in polite conversation. At page 44 Colonel Green refers to *ap* "as a substitute for the second person to express respect in addressing a superior in rank, like the English words 'sir,' 'your honour,' 'your worship,' etc." This mistake is common among Europeans, and it has a mischievous effect. The word *ap* is not necessarily used in addressing a superior. On the contrary it is commonly used out of courtesy. The meaning put upon it by Colonel Green is, however, accepted by many Englishmen who avoid the use of the word *ap*, and use the word *tum* in addressing respectable Indians and often, by so doing, unconsciously insult them. Curiously enough Colonel Green falls into the other extreme at p. 149 where to the word *mali* ("gardener") he attaches the affix *ji*. The affix *ji* is added as a special mark of respect, and would not ordinarily be applied to a gardener. There are other colloquial errors in some of the exercises which an Indian, whose mother tongue is Hindustani, would have detected. But the Grammar nevertheless possesses real merit and is likely to be useful. It undoubtedly supplies a want, as its predecessors were too elementary to be of much value except to beginners.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1896.

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). "R. E. C." "Railway Enterprise in Western India." Pope, Dr. G. U. "Leaves from an old Indian's Note Book." Kabiruddin, Kazi. "How I discovered the Ashburner Trees." Bahadurji, J. N. "Medical Aid for Indian Women."

Westminster Review. Hewitt, J. F. "Hindu Civilization under British Rule."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1896.

"A Directory of the Chief Industries of India." (W. Thacker and Co.) .... — —

"The *Indian Textile Journal* Reference Sheet of Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills in India." (F. A. Nodal, Manchester) ...... 2s. 0d.

Arnold, Sir Edwin, K.C.I.E., C.S.I. ...."East and West," with 41 Illustrations by R. T. Pritchett. (Longmans) .... 18s. 0d.

Sturdy, E. T. ...."Nârada Sûtra: an Enquiry into Love." Indian Ideals, No. I. (Longmans) .... 2s. 6d.

Ballantine, H. ...."On India's Frontier, or Nepal the Gurkha's Mysterious Land." 50 Plates. (George Redway) .... 7s. 6d.

Morris, Henry ...."The Governors-General of India." Portraits. (The Christian Literature Society of India) .... — —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

House of Commons Reports and Papers:—

135. East India. (Loans raised in England)—Return of, for the half year ended on 31st March, 1896 .... ½d.

Papers by Command:—

[7991.] East India (Opium)—Correspondence regarding the Report by the Royal Commission on Opium .... 6d.

[7997.] Trade of British India, Statement of the, with British Possessions and Foreign Countries for the Five Years 1890-91 to 1894-95 .... 2s. 9d.

[8042.] East India (North-west Frontier, Bashgal Valley)—Agreement signed by the Joint Commissioners for laying down the Afghan Boundary from the Hindu Kush Range to Nawa Kotal, and confirmed by H.H. the Amír of Afghanistan on the 19th December, 1895 .... ½d.

[8078.] East India (Indian Tariff Act and the Cotton Duties)—Papers relating to the Indian Tariff Act, 1896, and the Cotton Duties Act, 1896 (in continuation of C.—7602/1895.) .... 1s. 8d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.